

# **The Heritage Lodge**

## **No. 730, A.F. & A.M., G.R.C.**



**Instituted: Sept. 21, 1977**

**Constituted: Sept., 23, 1978**

# **PROCEEDINGS**

**Vol. 9, 1985 – 86**

**Worshipful Master:**

**R.W.Bro. Robert S. Throop**

**Editor: R.W.Bro. Jacob (Jack) Pos**

10 Mayfield Avenue,  
Guelph, Ont., N1G 2L8

## FORWARD

It is with pleasure that I write the introduction to the Proceedings for the year 1985-86.

Without detracting in any way from the authors of the other papers presented during this fiscal year, I nevertheless feel compelled to make special mention of the outstanding lecture given by Br. the Hon. John Ross Matheson on the occasion of the second annual Heritage Banquet. In my opinion this lecture will make this edition of our Proceedings a treasured possession for the serious student of Masonry for years to come.

The aims and objectives of the Heritage Lodge seem to be moving along at a goodly pace. The emphasis placed on preserving our Masonic historical knowledge is quite clear in our seven principal objectives.

It has been said that through history one is persuaded to develop critical attitudes, and in the words of Thomas Jefferson "Ajudge of the actions and design of men".

It was Francis Bacon who wrote "History makes men wise". Let us hope that our efforts in this regard in the Heritage Lodge No. 730 will foster and promote Masonic wisdom in ourselves and in those who follow.

It has been indeed an honour to serve as the ninth Worshipful Master of the Heritage Lodge.

Robert S. Throop W.M.



ROBERT SHELDON THROOP

Worshipful Master, 1985 - 86

Initiated in Harmony Lodge No. 370, ..... 1946  
 Wor. Master of Temple Lodge No. 665, ..... 1963  
 Affil. member of Temple Lodge No. 666, ... 1965  
 Affil. member of Temple Lodge No. 649, ... 1976  
 Honourary member of Simpson Lodge No. 157, 1984  
 Affil. member The Heritage Lodge No. 730, . 1978  
 Grand Senior Warden, G.R.C., ..... 1973  
 Member of Board of General Purposes, ..... 1979-  
 Kingston Lodge of Perfection, A. & A.S.R., . 1972  
 Rose of Sharon Chapter Rose Croix, ..... 1973  
 Moore Sovereign Consistory, ..... 1973  
 H.R.A. Pentalpha Chapter No. 28, Oshawa, . 1983  
 Affil. member Toronto Lodge of Perfection  
 and Sovereign Chapter Rose Croix, . 1983

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS

These proceedings introduce several innovative and provocative suggestions for changes in the organization and management of Freemasonry in Ontario. Concerned Masons feel strongly that the 'grass-roots' of our organization should be given a greater voice in planning the future course of our Craft. By encouraging active participation through a balanced and more equitable representation, interest in the Craft can be revitalized and the decline in membership reversed.

The tribulations of Freemasonry in Hungary, as reported by V.W.Bro. Emery Gero, should remind us all that we, as masons in a democratic society, enjoy a unique freedom; and we must guard our ramparts against dictatorial powers, that could erode this freedom, with fervour and zeal. Therefore, to insure that apathy and complacency does not yield to dictatorial powers, we must promote a more aggressive attitude to government by the membership.

The present structure of Grand Lodge makes it difficult to implement major reforms or long term commitments. Unless a worthy project can be completed within a two year period, 'rulers' of the Craft are not likely to initiate a project that cannot be completed during their term of office. Therefore, changes are required to allow for or to bring about a long term gradual improvement of our organization to shift some of the authority to a governing body that truly represents the overall membership.



## DISCLAIMER

The contributors Proceedings of the Lodge are alone responsible for the opinions expressed and also for the accuracy of the statements made therein. The opinions expressed by the contributors do not necessarily reflect the opinions, attitudes or policies of The Heritage Lodge No. 730, G.R.C.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Forward,.....	i
The Worshipful Master, R.W.Bro. Robert S. Throop,.....	ii
Editorial Comments,.....	iii
Disclaimer,.....	iv
Table of Contents,.....	v
— Substance or Shadow? Masonry Today --- and Maybe Tomorrow! A Point of View by V.W.Bro. Stewart Thurtell,.....	1
Paper Reviews by:	
R.W.Bro. Carl Casselman,.....	23
R.W.Bro. Donald Hall,.....	26
R.W.Bro. Murray Wagg,.....	27
Response to Paper Reviews by V.W.Bro. S. Thurtell,.....	30
Thanking The Speaker by R.W.Bro. Wallace E. McLeod,.....	35
— New Horizons - For Freemasonry in Ontario by R.W.Bro. Jack Pos,.....	37
— Fidelity, Fidelity, Fidelity - But To What? An Assessment of Freemasonry by Bro.The Hon., John R.Matheson Q.C.,	56
— The History of Hungarian Masonry by V.W.Bro. Emery I. Gero,.....	78
Response to V.W.Bro. Gero's Paper by R.W.Bro. Balfour LeGresley,.....	106
Introduction of W.Bro. Glenison T. Jones by R.W.Bro. K.L.Whiting, Sr.G. Warden Allied Masonic Degrees of Canada....	110
— The Byways of Masonry by W.Bro. G.T. Jones,.....	114

Response to W.Bro. Jones' Paper by R.W.	
Bro. Rountree,.....	140
Our Departed Brethren,.....	143
Lodge Officers, Past Masters and	
Committees,.....	144
Past Master, R.W.Bro. Balfour LeGresley	146

# "SUBSTANCE OR SHADOW? MASONRY TODAY

- - - AND MAYBE TOMORROW!"

## A Point of View\*

by

V.W.Bro. Stewart Thurtell

The genesis of this paper was the writer's experience as a district secretary in 1978, which produced some original research in a paper titled "A Point of Departure" of February 1980, and a later one of October 1983 similarly titled to this presentation, both of which were submitted to the Long Range Planning Committee of grand Lodge.

This paper is intended to express concern for the frail, incomplete and somewhat "ramshackle" organization we call "Masonry." It is the writer's hope that it may also be an opening waft of a breeze which is becoming the winds of change, which are beginning to blow away the cobwebs of outmoded certainty.

Fear of Change, reluctance to embrace new concepts, and unwillingness to replace the familiar with the novel seem to be inborn in the human kind, which may be illustrated by the aphorism: "People are down on things they are not up on!"

---

\*Paper presented at the Regular meeting of The Heritage Lodge held in the Preseton-Hespeler Masonic Temple, Cambridge, Wednesday Evening, September 18, 1985.

Remember it! Imprint it on your mind: "People are down on things they are not up on!" "People are down on things they are not up on!" Here is the basic impediment to change and reform, and any proposals altering the familiar must take this aspect of human nature into account.

It is a truism that the only constant is change! Abrupt and fearsome change is: Revolution. Gradual and selective change is: Evolution. Change by design is: Reform!

Reform implies re-adjustment of former practices for the improvement of conditions. Reform ought to be more evolutionary than revolutionary.

I have here in my hand a little fossil, - called a "brachiopod", some 10 to 15 million years old, give or take a few million. This small creature, akin to the oyster or perhaps the scallop, couldn't adapt! Thus the alternative to evolution becomes: either adapt or be turned to stone! I am suggesting some proposals to avoid "fossilization", proposals I expect will be resisted, - - - - but then, - the fact of making this presentation must be some sort of progress, at that!

Before there can be any reforms, or changes or working out of new principles, somehow or other, we must determine the facts. Knowledge being the key to wisdom, wide participation in deciding and securing the facts is the key to understanding the "reality of the Craft", - and once we understand the dimensions of our dilemma, - we will no longer evade reform or fear change.

Reform begins with knowledge, - knowledge



of what we are and have; and what we ought to become. With such knowledge we can then "test the waters" to decide on the best possibilities for achieving our goals. This is nothing less than a complete re-thinking of the whole Craft in the Province of Ontario.

The paradoxes innate in the Craft:

#### Paradox I

Attempting to improve our Order requires us to examine every facet of the Craft! The paradox being: that it is so un-structured, so un-coordinated and so disconnected that there is absolutely no organization in existence within our Order that is capable of carrying out such research.

#### Paradox II

In order to study the Craft in depth, a new organization must be created to perform this task. The reality of setting-up such a task force is, in itself, a reform within the Order, and something of an act of faith, which ultimately step-by-step can determine the dimensions of our problems and lead us logically to their solutions.

I trust this is sufficient introduction to presentation of my paper, "SUBSTANCE OR SHADOW? MASONRY TODAY -- AND MAYBE TOMORROW!" This paper is a "point of view" for which I make no apology. I have tried to avoid the use of complicated numbers, slanders and other complaint devices, - primarily because the whole question is far more complicated and convoluted than it appears initially. It may appear to be hitting at certain areas in an unfair manner, but I don't really think so.

But I have not found it useful to recite all the many problems with which we are beset, due to the fact that there are far too many to list, and so intertwined that a clear description might be almost impossible. At least, I was unable to do it. I sincerely hope this presentation upsets a few people.

Masonry in Ontario in 1984 has some 101,000 members, but can probably boast of no more than 10% as active masons, some 7 to 10,000 at the outside. If Project H\*O\*M\*E is any sort of reflection on the level of activity, - then 7% is a generous estimate. For many years there has been a constant plea for increased participation, without apparent improvement, which seems to imply that the traditional appeal will not work.

Nowadays, in a highly mobile society where the old verities are being called into question; where the old values have become battered and broken; where time demands on men have become enormous; where stress and strain are almost normal conditions of life, - the very thought of traditional solutions almost becomes a guarantee of failure.

Presumably, men become masons for a variety of reasons, but only a few seem to become caught up in the lodge activity and involve themselves beyond the minimum. It is something of a paradox that many of the "rare attenders" still continue to pay their dues and choose to call themselves masons. Perhaps this is due to the claim of belonging to an exclusive society which generates a reluctance to forswear those solemn promises given in the course of receiving the several degrees. Whatever this tenuous hold may be, it seems to exist, and might be developed mightily by

reforming the organization into a more cohesive, more interactive and responsible society.

There are at least two related subjects to be explored:

1. The gradual erosion of total membership due to steadily increasing average age levels because of attrition, and little real growth;
2. The organizational and structural weaknesses within the fraternity would seem to almost force limited participation, and perpetuate the innate deficiencies of the Order.

Any attempt to propose remedies will require a description of the patient, a diagnosis on the nature of the illness, and some prescriptions to restore the body to health.

#### A GENERAL STATEMENT ON THE STRUCTURE OF MASONRY IN ONTARIO

1. There are four levels in the structure:  
(i) the individual lodge; (ii) the Grand Lodge; (iii) the Masonic District; (iv) the individual mason.
2. The heart of masonry is in the individual lodge with our beautiful ritual as the unifying factor. Here the mason is created and most masonic careers are accomplished entirely within its portals.
3. The Grand Lodge is the creature of the lodges and so, therefore are the Masonic

Districts, whilst the individual lodges operate and manage their own affairs with virtual autonomy.

4. The present structure of masonry is more shadow than of substance. The principal emphasis of Grand Lodge has been ritual, whereby the authority of Grand Lodge has had little effect on the operation of the lodges except, perhaps, in the role of a "vatican city" in maintaining the purity of the "faith", subject to a few constitutional requirements including the financial obligations.

5. While Grand Lodge is presumed to be subject to the collective will of the lodges, it has not been very representative of or responsive and responsible to the needs of the lodges, except, perhaps, in an administrative sense. The current perception is that the Board of General Purposes is too narrowly drawn, with the out-lying districts under-represented, and where the appointed members do not seemingly give broad geographical representation.

6. There is a perception that the Grand Lodge sessions are not much of a forum for discussion so much as something of a "rubber stamp" for policies decided in advance, and where procedural red tape makes discussion and differences of opinion impossible. Amendments to the constitution may be extensively debated in the Board of General Purposes prior to the annual meeting of Grand Lodge with the open sessions limited to ratify such decisions, virtually without debate.

7. To many masons, Grand Lodge is aloof and distant and even all-powerful. The Grand



Master is perceived to be remote, being visible only rarely, on the occasion of a district reception every two years. Outside of the major cities and the Grand Master's home territory, no recent Grand Master is remembered for having made a fraternal visit to a lodge just for fun.

8. The Masonic District is too often more apparent than real, without a continuing organization except for a Past Master's and Officers Association which, more often than not, probably functions primarily as a social institution rather than as an administrative or directing body. Each year the DDGM's may come and go, leaving little impact of permanent value in the district. Some districts may have some overall programs which give continuity, direction and some discipline to the lodges, but this is not general or even required.

9. The individual lodges continue to operate very much on their own. Regardless of lodge size, only a very few members will participate in making decisions, and likely most of them will be Past Masters. Except for certain constitutional requirements, each lodge is free to act as it chooses, with the presence of the Grand Lodge not very relevant.

Too many lodges have gotten to become something like the private fief of a few "long tenure" members, reluctant to change, often have a cavalier attitude toward the constitution and the lodge by-laws and may consider any new proposal as akin to treason, or worse. Internal reform of a lodge may be suspended by some active members in consideration of the feelings of "the old guard!"



We applaud these fraternal considerations, even though the health of the lodge may continue to deteriorate. There are rare occasions where a DDGM will be called on to impose some discipline on a lodge, and then for a particular specific reason. Collectively, then, the Grand Lodge (including the District) have little influence on the individual lodge, and, by extension, to the individual mason.

### THE SUCCESS OF PROJECT H\*O\*M\*E REVEALS 'SEVEN PERCENT PARTICIPATION'

Project H\*O\*M\*E, if viewed as something of a "Masonic Gallup Poll" on masonic participation should be cause for alarm!

In one district, successful as the 8th in total amount out of 43 masonic districts attracted only 6.42% of the district members who contributed directly, with an average of \$1.46 per member of the district. For Ontario as a whole, a total of some \$117,000.00 was donated from among 101,069 members, an average of \$1.16 per member. Stretch the 6.42% figure, let's call it 7% for easy figuring, which, if borne out by analysis of the contributions made, means that only some 7,100 masons participated, which thus also means that 94,000 masons did not participate. Even if the actual rate of participation should be double that one district's figure, - it would only be about 15%!

The organizing and setting-up of Project H\*O\*M\*E in all 43 districts meant building a new organization from scratch; getting it to function effectively; - and then allowing it

to collapse and die on completion of the project, which demise seems wasteful, needless and short-sighted. Any future Ontario-wide masonic program will again have to go through the same frustrations, follow a similar learning curve, likely make the same mistakes and then see it die without the Order profitting from the experience.

If 7% turns out to be the general level of support; if the "Seven Percenters" are our active masons, - then our Order is weak indeed.

The low level of participation can only be reversed and improved by strengthening the organizational structure so that jurisdiction-wide programs can be fitted into an existing framework for administration and implementation. In fact, a basic objective will be shown to be reorganizing the masonic district in the re-structuring of the Order.

#### REFORM AS AN ANSWER TO COMPLACENCY

The word "reform" in the structural sense is to overhaul the mechanism without compromising the esoteric and ritualistic functions at all! In the past many useful programs have been attempted, e.g. masonic education. The results have been limited, primarily because such programs have been really "preaching to the converted!"

The reforms suggested here offer, as a basic premise, "A Functioning Mechanism must Precede Programs." To have a potential for any degree of success, such structural reforms must be universal and uncompromising.

## RESTATEMENT OF THE TWO BASIC PROBLEMS

1. Reverse the membership decline;
2. Strengthen all four levels" (i) the lodge; (2) the Grand Lodge; (iii) the district; (iv) the individual mason.

From the General Statement on the Structure, it is possible that the present "shadow organization" can be reformed and revitalized to become the basis for a new beginning.

## GOING FROM HERE TO THERE

Masonry is a voluntary organization which is governed by consent. Its rich heritage is glued together by our beautiful ritual. Those few, those Seven Percenters, have been keeping it alive in the face of massive indifference. Craft masonry has, by default, turned the masonic interest of many of its members toward activity in the appendant bodies; e.g. The R.A.M.; the A. & A.S.R.; and the Shrine, to say nothing of non-masonic activities.

Thus, any rebuilding program must ultimately provide greater scope for its members to take part and identify with its goals and its activity. Part of that activity will be local, within the lodge, and in the community. Basic to increased local activity is a perception of a higher public profile, more community visibility, and even to be identified with worthy causes and overall local concerns. The local lodge should become involved with inter-lodge and district activity on an ongoing and continuing basis. This must be done to develop the required increased participation by the ordinary members, as well as by the Past Master's and

officers. Joint activity implies leadership and discipline at the district level, it requires increased involvement by the several lodges and their members.

Regional groupings of districts, as originally proposed by the Long Range Planning Committee for the future system of election to the Board of General Purposes promised opportunities and scope for involving several districts in common programs, and to indirectly revitalize an ongoing connection with the Grand Lodge.

A reformed Board of General Purposes, more broadly based, more responsive and responsible to its electorate would offer the prospect of increased vitality and the development of new directions in the service of the Craft. Improved communications between the "grass-roots" and the policy-makers is an inviting prospect for an expanding future for the Order.

There are awesome difficulties involved in implementing any massive changes and reforms, but those men of vision within our Order must recognize that ongoing renewal and reform are needed if progress is to be achieved, to say nothing of the hope for survival of our society.

#### OTHER VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS COMPARED

Service clubs, churches, sporting associations and other broadly based voluntary organizations have found it desirable to require their local units and regional groupings to develop highly organized directorates and committees, and to work



together in inter-region joint projects. Each local unit and regional grouping is something like a mirror-image of any other. Uniformity of structure, communication and reporting, using standard manuals and documentation, together with overall commitment to a common goal are generally conceded to be necessary organizational features.

Local specific committees are usually expected to conduct joint regional meetings, seminars and workshops with their counterparts to educate and develop expertise in their particular activity. In such gatherings, firm friendships are forged, mutual understanding is enhanced, and useful and successful activity is fostered. Regional conventions or assemblies attract members at every level, with a mixture of social activity and serious business cementing loyalty and expanding the horizons of those attending.

One of the hallmarks of the service club is the built-in expectation that each and every member will contribute to the success of the enterprise, - and enjoy a lot of fun and fellowship in the process. The operative word is "involvement!"

### THE FRAMEWORK EXISTS

Masonry in Ontario already has a "shadow organization" in place! We have a central body, a district and the local unit (the lodge). We have them in place, but there is no imperative impetus to bring them together in a cohesive whole. No systematic research has ever been undertaken to determine the attitudes and ideas of our members, or to gather the facts on the operation of our



lodges, or to develop a statistical base on the condition of masonry across our jurisdiction. Such research would seem to be a very good starting place, - but the present structure would make it difficult to organize such studies. But there is a potential for making such a beginning!

The Long Range Planning Committee did produce a very challenging report, sufficiently realistic to upset a few of our long-tenure senior people. It represented reforms that many thoughtful masons considered important and needed. It is asking for reform! Change is needed and inevitable, - and the demand is developing a momentum of its own.

Expansion of the L.R.P.C. to develop into something of a "research and development directorate", with subsidiary working groups in each district would seem to be a logical step. The organizing of a district agency in each district could create a permanent communications link which could be developed to perform specific tasks, and undertake particular research projects in the local area and across the province.

#### EXPANDING THE FRAMEWORK

The initial "research organization" with a branch in each district, equipped with appropriate terms of reference and clear objectives and authority to perform its mission can become an ongoing basis for development into a permanent part of the "masonic infra-structure." There may be some consitutional adjustments required, but such constraints need not be obstacles.

Having taken the first step by creating a workable "research directorate" across the jurisdiction, and working to survey the lodges and masons generally to determine the facts and the opinions held, then reporting back on their findings, will be a good beginning. This crucial step can provide a statistical profile (a data base) and give insights into the real condition of masonry, - and may even suggest other enquiries and proposals.

Maintaining the organization developed in each district on a continuing basis will make it possible to subsequently transform this into a permanent vehicle for reforming the district structure. Part of the initial research should be directed toward defining the new role of the district and developing a district support organization as a future goal.

It would seem desirable that reform of the district structure should include establishment of some authority and supervision over the several lodges in each district and enhance interaction between them.

Accumulation of research, and building a permanent data base, using studies on statistics, attitudes, opinions and perceived needs at all levels will aid in the creation of policies and programs suitable for development, and provide the framework for implementing the product of such activity. Having constructed an organization, responsible to a central policy body, with feedback to and from the districts and their lodges, actively seeking the participation of ordinary lodge members can only result in increased activity at every level, and across the jurisdiction.

Such a data base, with reciprocal information production and feed-back may be tied to a computer system at Grand Lodge for constant up-date and implementation. The use of a computer system is only a question of time, particularly with the expansion of information available as the result of the restructuring process once it is initiated.

Over time, then, these proposals offer a readily adaptable system of communication, responsibility, program and project development and discipline across the jurisdiction. It has the advantage of using the existing framework, expanding its role, and making possible all sorts of possibilities as yet unforeseen.

#### A SUMMATION

This presentation was begun by making a plea for reform of our Order and defining the nature of reform. There were also some remarks on the nature of masonry in general, an outline of our present structure, a dissertation on Project H\*O\*M\*E and its meaning for us, stating that the 7% participation level ought to jar and shame us into reform!

The plea for reform became more general and universal in application; in the process of offering ideas, we got caught up in the Long Range Planning Committee, which then seemed like a very good idea, but is now very much a lame duck after its efforts were largely side-tracked, edited and smothered into irrelevance. Which means "so much for trying to reform our Order by traditional means!"

We compared other organizations; a plan was offered to use our present structure more effectively. Again, it was emphasized that masonry in Ontario does not, - has not, and probably will not use our man-power resources efficiently and effectively unless shown how it may be done. But development of the structure discussion left some gaps, so following are some relevant figures.

The first table indicates the decline of masonry in the last year. It is broken down by lodges and districts as well as the whole. The total number of lodges used were taken to be 648, as having been in existence in 1983 and thus reflect changes. Analysis of the figures given in the 1984 Proceedings showed a few anomalies, but are taken to be reasonably accurate, plus or minus a little bit.

So the gains and losses figures illustrate our dilemma. Masons are a very small part of the Ontario population, as probably would be expected. but why are we declining, when the male population is still growing? And population growth continues. Which indicates our general weakness as a body of influence; unable to attract young men in sufficient quantities to offset our losses, and we probably would be unwilling to let the younger generation into the higher levels of our Order until they are too old, grey and incapable of vision.

Just to keep the record straight, let's look at some figures taken from the 1984 Proceedings and other resources:



Ontario Males, 20 year and older	3,973,000
Ontario Masons	101,069 = 2½

1983 to 1984 Lodge changes:

Lodges with no membership gains 53

Lodges with gains	143	+	425
Lodges with losses	452	-	2642

No. of Lodges	648	-	2217
	Net loss		

Of the 43 Masonic Districts only one (Grey) had a membership gain (3). Not much to cheer about!

Slow erosion year-by-year, lodge-by-lodge, district-by-district. Which points out something of the widespread perceptions held of the senior levels of our Order. Not only do we not gain much benefit from the man-power we have got, - - - we don't seem to get much feed-back or response from the "executive council" or Board of General Purpose of Grand Lodge. There is a common thread of various perceptions held in masonry which may not be valid, - but are held nonetheless. and foremost is one very widely held, that unless we have a very prominent man - don't try to run for the Board of General Purposes unless we can get support in the Toronto area, - we don't stand a chance, otherwise. And if we can't get our boy elected to the Grand Board, - - then our chances of getting a Grand Master are absolutely nil! All because the Constitution was changed to require such election which still further limited the opportunity for participation within our Order.



Growth of the Order peaked in the Fifties, but has begun a decline, not only in Craft lodges, but also in the Royal Arch and other appendant bodies. And at the same time as we decry all this, our Order is guilty of using only a tiny fraction of its talent, leaving many to seek other activity. At any rate, if we look at the "Masonic Executive" in Ontario, it would seem that the Board of General Purpose is also narrowly drawn:

Board of General Purpose	20	
DDGM's (1 year)	43	
	<u>63</u>	63

#### Non-Elected

By Virtue of Office (PGM'S)	11*	
Appointed	16	
Honorary	7	
	<u>34</u>	34
*PGM'S elected to other office - 2		—
Total		97

As DDGM'S are less than full-time delegates to the Board and General Purposes, then there are only 20 active elected members on Board. With only 11 seats available each year for election (other than the GM & DGM) the influence of the elected members (33%) on Board policy can not be termed overwhelming. Which brings us to look at the source of our talent:

Voting Delegates to GL 1984	3928
Total votes carried	4768

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \text{Percent Board to delegates} & = & \\ 97 & \times & 100 = 2.5\% \\ 3928 & & \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \text{Percent elected Board} & = & \\ 20 & \times & 100 = 0.5\% (1/2 \text{ of } 1\%) \\ 3928 & & \end{array}$$

Again, the question of Board of General Purposes membership raised is really one of perception, - perhaps perception much more than of substance; nonetheless that perception is one of a tradition-bound and somewhat inbred group of dedicated and devoted brethren who are reluctant to embrace change, controversy and dissent. No such blanket statement can really be fair to all our fine fellows, but if there is a small kernel of truth in all this, then none of us should be reluctant to admit it, or to articulate it.

The significant thread winding through all this is our preoccupation with ritual, and the self-limiting use of our manpower that results. It ought to be obvious! - - - we just are not using our talent that is available! And we fail to use our manpower at all levels. In effect, - we have institutionalized apathy! We have made a virtue out of complacency and the status quo! We are underwhelmed by smug indifference. We have not given our people enough to do! We need a better way of using our bank account of talent.

### IT HAS ALL BEEN SAID BEFORE

At the Grand Master's Banquet in 1978 the excellent speaker was M. W. Bro. Jerry Rasor

of Ohio, then Grand Master of the largest masonic jurisdiction in North America. Bro. Rasor said, - - - "if Freemasonry is going to make strides in the future we've got to use imagination, innovation and invention to solve the problems which lie ahead." He added that if we do, - - we can change apathy to enthusiasm! We can change the negatives to positives! - and that is the Name of the Game!

Among other pungent comments, Bro. Rasor reflected that in visiting a lodge he often sees a lot of grey heads, - indicating lots of experience and maturity: but if he sees few, if any, young men, he knows that such a lodge is in difficulty.

The young men live in a different world today from we old guys, and we've got to do different, inventive and innovative things if we are going to interest such young men in not only becoming Freemasons, but in getting involved and taking an active role in the Craft.

### REPRISE

None of these proposals are definitive, earth-shattering or profound, and are, in a way, a continuation of an earlier effort by the writer.

Over the years, one of the constant conditions observed in our lodges has been the fact that lodge attendance rarely amounts to more than a small fraction of the total membership, - regardless of lodge size or numbers of members.

We have made no real effort to study

these phenomena; no great effort to provide scope for increased activity by our members; no true challenges for expanded activity; - and certainly no channel for the ambitious to reach the supreme pinnacle of our Order.

Does this mean that our Grand Lodge system of 2 year terms for all but the DDGM'S and the junior Grand Lodge chairs is cast in reinforced concrete? Does this mean that unless a brother is appointed a "cardinal" he can never be "Pope"? Does it mean that a body often referred to in conversation, - but not mentioned in our Book of Constitution, a group called the "Grand East" seems to have an influence of great power within our Order, - and apparently beyond any challenge from the "swamp dwellers"! This body is cited, primarily due to the recurring appointments made to the Board, year-after-year-after-year of some faithful servants, - yet continuing to ignore the many talents that are "out there" in the distance. Does one have to be from Southern Ontario, - from the Toronto-Windsor-Kingston triangle to reach the top?

Isn't it time that a good hard-nosed reassessment is made of how things are handled? Isn't it time we looked ahead as well as back? Isn't it time we began to use our talent to shout out to the world about our wonderful fraternity!? We ought to be excited enough to carry our message to a soured world bogged down in mediocrity, - make use of publicity and public relations techniques a little more recent than "the quill pen and the green eyeshade" and get on with it!

There is only INERTIA standing between the only two possibilities we have: either



## PROGRESS or IRRELEVANCE!

So, brethern of Heritage Lodge, - we have a challenge to pursue. Imagination, innovation and invention are waiting for us to embrace them. We have to look at ourselves, research our system, and in the process get a lot of masons to help dig out the facts at all levels - at the lodge, - at the district, - and at the pinnacle itself!

Let us act as if we had fire in our bellies! Let's organize a continuing research program across our jurisdiction to define our problems. Then we will become a forum to propose policies for the future. Let us be sure of one thing, - and be absolutely clear on this very important point: We must be as committed to the future as we are appreciative of our past! Let's look at those things we have been doing for 130 years, and not just stick to the "tried and true"! - - because they're not working too well just now. By all means let us measure our achievements. But let us use our talents in building our future.

If we don't do it, --- who will?

---and as Jerry Rasor said at the end of his speech, quoting from the "My Fair Lady" song title - - -"SHOW ME! - - and SHOW ME NOW!"

REVIEWS OF PAPER PRESENTED TO  
THE HERITAGE LODGE

September 18, 1985

by

V.W.Bro. Stewart Thurtell titled  
"Substance or Shadow? Masonry Today - - -  
and Maybe Tomorrow!

FIRST REVIEW - was prepared by R.W.Bro. Carl Casselman, P.D.D.G.M., Georgian District, and read in lodge by R.W.Bro. Frank J. Bruce.

Worshipful Master and Brethren:

I must first express my humble apologies for not being present this evening in Heritage Number 730; but I do have two excellent reasons. We are celebrating our wedding anniversary and it is also the official visit of the District Deputy Grand Master to my Lodge. My absence will permit me to fulfill my family obligation by taking my wife to dinner, fulfill my masonic obligation by attending lodge, and through the gracious acceptance of R.R.Bro. Frank Bruce, have this review presented on my behalf.

You are to be congratulated V. Wor. Bro. Thurtell for presenting a fine thought provoking paper on a topic in which I have had more than a passing interest for a number of years. The two subjects that you addressed were:

- (1) the decline in membership, and
- (2) the structural weakness within the Order.

You may recall that in the 1984 Grand Lodge proceedings, the Long Range Planning Committee studied declining membership and recorded twelve major points which contributed to SUCCESSFUL LODGES. These twelve points were condensed from a thirty-four point manifesto with input from a cross section of this Grand Jurisdiction. The key points that came through loud and clear were:

(a) Successful lodges have become proficient in making their NEW members into practicing Freemasons who thoroughly understand our basic beliefs and are able to relate to them, and

(b) They offer a common meeting ground for men of goodwill to meet in an undisturbed atmosphere of mutual trust and understanding.

I wholeheartedly agree with your statement that we are not using the manpower we have available. Consider the fact that each lodge has at its disposal several well qualified senior members who are inactive. We have all heard the statement made by a Past Master or a Past District Deputy Grand Master and I quote "I'm only a has been" or "I've been put out to pasture". These brethren could be brought back into the fold and put to work. Their talents and expertise can be utilized by encouraging them to assist the new Mason for at least a year following his admission to membership. This, of course, serves a two-fold purpose by:

- (1) activating the senior member, and
- (2) instructing the new initiate.

With this program in place, perhaps we can generate a greater interest and awareness of

our Craft in our new members and make our senior members active, participating Masons. We might then see a reversal in our declining membership.

A more equitable distribution of membership to the Board of General Purposes has been achieved during the past several years. Since our last Annual Communication of Grand Lodge the elected and appointed members of the Board represent twenty-six of the forty-three Districts in the Jurisdiction, or 60% of the Districts are represented. You will agree that the Board of General Purposes now comprises a more equal distribution of membership and can therefore more readily reflect the wants and needs of the individual Mason.

I am particularly interested in your comments regarding the Long Range Planning Committee. Its prime reasons for existence is to submit recommendations that will lead to measures designed to further the best interests of our beloved Craft. Several Districts have a Long Range Planning Committee in place and are meeting on a regular basis. The need for closer liaison and co-ordination is recognized and will be established between the various District Long Range Planning Committees and their Grand Lodge counterpart.

Your suggestion of a research organization could come under the umbrella of the Long Range Planning Committee or perhaps the now expanded Condition of Masonry. A data collecting agency as you have outlined could provide valuable information on the effects of an ever changing society and its influence on our membership. The wants and needs of today's Mason are vastly different from those



of fifty or even twenty-five-years ago. Have we kept pace with a changing society? If not, how can we fill the void that has contributed to our membership decline?

In conclusion I would again congratulate you V.W.Bro. Thurtell on presenting an excellent paper which certainly meets the high standards expected in Heritage Lodge. You presented your point of view to invite controversy, active disagreement and articulate dialogue. I'm confident that you have achieved your objective.

SECOND REVIEW - was prepared by R.W.Bro. Donald R. Hall, P.D.D.G.M., Frontenac District and read by R.W.Bro. David C. Bradley.

Worshipful Master and Brethren:

V.Wor.Bro. Thurtell outlines some reasons contributing to the decline of Masonic membership and offers suggestions which would aid in the strengthening of our organization.

In summarizing the effects of the many facets of Masonry upon its members the author may have belaboured some points and may have placed too much emphasis on the H.O.M.E. project as an example of how Masons are neglecting their obligations. It appears that since this project originated in and was to be completed in the Toronto area, that those Brethren from a distance did not place it too high in their priorities, Why? project H.E.L.P. was very successful. Could this impetus have been, or be perpetuated?

Possibly the author gives an answer to

this question when he refers to the Long Range Planning Committee's report on the regional grouping of districts. He gives positive reactions to this report in a very convincing manner, to the extent that those who read his paper will be forced to re-study the L.R.P.C. report.

Brother Thurtell touches on the success of service Clubs and although one may shudder to think that Masonic Lodges would become another Service Club, it should be observed that they are very successful in getting every member involved. Most Service Clubs have a vastly superior attendance record that Masonic Lodges do not have.

The author gives adequate reasons why there should be some structural changes in Masonry and who should be involved in drawing up the suggestions for change. Will someone please listen to him?

This is not the first paper with viewpoints about "Masonry Today" and it will not be the last. It calls for careful thinking followed by open minded discussion. Brother Thurtell's paper should not be read and then shelved but rather it should stimulate thought, promote controversy, and lead to much needed change. Will those who can, listen and act?

THIRD REVIEW - was prepared by R.W.Bro. Murray Wagg, P.D.D.G.M., Toronto, District 3 and read by R.W.Bro. Jack Pos.

Worshipful Master and Brethren:

I must first thank R.W.Bro.Frank Bruce for the opportunity to review this thought-provoking paper, the main thrust of which I first became aware of as a member of the Long Range Planning Committee a couple of years ago.

While Bro. Thurtell puts forward a very strong argument for reform, which I generally agree is required, his recommendation for a survey to determine the dimensions of our problems is to my mind the most salient and important point made, and should be followed through on without delay. I would suggest that all members be surveyed, i.e., active and inactive, demitted and suspended even though it may be difficult to differentiate between reasonable criticism and petty personal sniping. A question on lodge attendance/involvement in years of strong, innovative exciting leadership versus dull, unimaginative leadership should be included.

I personally feel that many of the things that Bro. Thurtell suggests are wrong with Masonry are what makes us different from other fraternal organizations, most of which are suffering from similar membership and attendance problems as well as that of who carried the load. It seems that very few people today want to make a commitment for more than a short period of time. This is the "me" generation which is supposed to be full of fun and excitement with little time left over for serious matters, and Masonry is, for the most part (initially at least), a serious matter. By the time men become Masons today, in their 30's and 40's, their lifestyles and priorities in their public and private avocations are already pretty firmly established; therefore, fewer members have

time (or are willing to devote time) for involvement in Masonic activities. Perhaps more in depth investigating of applicants to make sure that at least some of our candidates have the qualifications of time and talent to be officers and/or committee members is the answer here.

Bro. Thurtell cites the low response rate to Project H.O.M.E. as indicative of our level of activity, i.e. less than 7% across the jurisdiction. There is nothing unusual about this, Project H.E.L.P. received about the same kind of response, and the United Church of Canada's recently completed Ventures in Mission program reached its objective through the generosity of only a few of its members, less than 10% countrywise as I recall.

Frank, I fear I have used up my allotment of 200 to 300 words for this review already, when much more could be said. Suffice it to say, I congratulate Stu Thurtell on his determination to stir up some thought and discussion (and hopefully action) on a subject of great concern to many of us, i.e. the revitalization of our beloved Order.



RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS  
by  
V.W.Bro. Stuart Thurtell

RESPONSE to R.W.Bro. Carl Casselman:

In reference to the presentation statements concerning membership losses, reviewer then referred to the recent (1984) report of LRPC which grappled with this question; and whose response was to do a survey, from which came 12 attributes of the "Successful Lodge." To me, that's hardly an answer to the problem, - probably is really avoiding the problem, - and presents no overall or universal program to be implemented to stop the rot. Again, - there was no overall policy demonstrated, -nor any mechanism to demand action. In all likelihood, -the lodges which need help the most are those which have yet to hear of any such idea!

In reference to my statement of "wasted manpower" Bro. Casselman made something of a plea for re-activating P.M's etc now "out-to-pasture" but while I agree with this, - I am much more conscious and concerned about all our wasted manpower resources, particularly among our general membership. Why does the vast majority of our general membership never attend? Lets ask them why? Also those suspended & demitted ones. Here is some food for thought my Brethren. Last year ('84) our losses through death were almost exactly equal to our combined losses from dimits and suspensions. This ought to tell us something, for while there is little we can do to correct the effects of old age and infirmity, - surely there is some way of stemming our members

making a choice to depart?

My reviewer referred to the statement in '84 Proceedings that somehow the membership on the B of GP has become more equitable and representative in recent years, quoting the report that 26 districts of 43 have representation, 60% represented. Pardon my expletive-but "Balderdash!" That statement is a snow job! The fact is, the districts are a jerrymander; and not fairly divided or representative. With 650 lodges and 43 districts the median should be 15.1 lodges per district; -but they vary from as few as 8 lodges to as high as 26 lodges. It's no mystery why the outlying districts can't get their man elected, - as a 26 lodge district can sure outvote an 8 lodge district by better than 3 to 1, and the large city districts in combination have perpetuated this inequity. I was glad to see a small reference to this problem in the 1985 G.L. reports.

Bro. Casselman's remarks on the LRPC are very well taken, but it is my view that the original concept that this committee work on a general overview of our jurisdiction and making concrete recommendations, but it's mandate has apparently been watered-down to deal in piecemeal fashion with a few specific concerns, -and not to make too many waves to upset "the way things are!"

RESPONSE to R.W.Bro. Donald R. Hall.

I generally agree with this response, and he has a somewhat valid point when he mentions that Project H.O.M.E, being situated in the immediate Toronto area should have more impact

on the local masons than those far distant. That being said, -my district, Wilson District with 23 lodges with a little under a 7% response did a great deal better than, say, the 3 Hamilton Districts, or the two Niagara Districts which are a lot closer to Toronto. Again, it is my contention that this relatively low response indicates a general lack of support for universal programs, -and only a strong program with some real organization behind it can make any dents in the apathy.

#### RESPONSE TO R.W.BRO. MURRAY WAGG:

Bro. Wagg has hit the nail-on-the-head by recognizing the prime thrust of my paper is the desperate need to do the research across the entire jurisdiction to determine our problems, before any real reform can come about.

Also Bro. Wagg seems to feel that the objects of my criticism in our masonry are those things which separate us from and make us unique from other organizations, - which uniqueness may or may not be a virtue. In this sense, I think Bro. Wagg may very well be right that other organizations may share similar problems, -but if some other groups have a common difficulty that we too share, - it doesn't mean that we ought to just throw up our hands, and feel that there is nothing we can do! In fact, it is precisely because of the unique features in our masonry that I think we should be able to overcome most of these difficulties, with a good effort, good will and a tough-minded program which those other (need I say unfortunate) organizations

cannot match, due to our exclusive advantages. Advantages we have largely wasted by default, I think.

Bro. Waggon was a bit "target specific" when he spoke of the "ME" generation. Yes, there's lots in what he says about the early 70's bunch - but our difficulties go back to those of us in our 40's; 50's and 60's - and have been so for years and years! I can't really get too excited over the current crop and our lack of ability to attract and hold them. That could be the subject of a very good study group! I am really saying, I expect, that if we don't get off our sterns, and get some push going, - there may not be too much we can do - the whole 7,000 of us active masons, - as compared with the fantasy figures given in the annual proceedings.

With reference to Bro. Waggon comparing of the 7% response figure in Project H\*O\*M\*E that I have cited to the 10% contribution level in the United Church's missionary campaign, - I don't believe the circumstances are at all comparable. In fact, my cited response figure of 7%, remember, was based on the response in one of the better performing districts, and a few of them, like Brant, or the two London districts shouldn't feel too doggone complacent. So, the 7% is not the problem, - its a symptom of a problem to which we can only guess at the dimensions, of which we'll have to find out through research, - I hope!

Bro. Waggon made some marginal notes on my script, and I must say they were pungent and penetrating. I'm only sorry that I am unable to go over them with you. I will share the comment he made that in the development of our masonry we don't need a vast bureaucratic



horde, and I agree there is no virtue in needless complications and mindless petty details. I think we both agree that there ought to be some way of getting a useful development initiated in any one district put into some sort of a package by some central coordinating body and then getting it out to the other districts, - and if it really has some valid promise, -giving the poor and isolated District Deputy some clout to force compliance among his lodges. Otherwise, - nothing will happen, -and nothing will change.

That last statement may prove to be the epitaph of our masonry unless we get going.

## THANKING THE SPEAKER

by

R.W.Bro. Wallace E. McLeod.

Brother Thurtell, your zeal for the Institution of Freemasonry your exertion on its behalf are well known to all of us, your paper this evening breaks new ground for The Heritage Lodge and marks a radical departure from the historical studies that have been our standard fare in the past. The quest for truth takes many forms and it seems that there is never a solution to real problems. The old familiar story reminds us that the first step in persuading a mule to do what you want is to get its attention by hitting it over the head with a two by four.

Perhaps the way to get the attention of masonic authorities is to tread on a few toes, well brother Thurtell this evening you have gone down a pathway paved with toes; its a risky business, that is how I got my blood spattered all over the rug, for a while at least. Don't turn your back, you have given us food for thought and that is good. Of course it will never do to let you imaginatively agree with everything that was said. For example, you and your critics all have fine things to say about the Long Range Planning Committee, in my opinion the L.R.P.C. has done almost as much as some of our Past Grand Masters to destroy the effectiveness of the Board of General Purposes, but let that go.

The important thing is to get our thoughts out in the open and start people

thinking about them. We are all locked into the bureaucratic mind that says there are only two rules:

First, when in doubt mumble  
Second, when in doubt, get pressed,  
say no.

Our reaction no! no! we can't do that, that is tampering with the 'landmarks'. We'll, keep on the way we are and we will have no one to follow the plow from one landmark to the next.

Brother Thurtell, on behalf of all of us, I am privileged to express our gratitude for sharing your concerns with us and for jolting us out of our complacency with those provocative statements, Thank you.

## "NEW HORIZONS"\*

For Freemasonry in Ontario

by

R.W.Bro. Jacob (Jack) Pos

Many progressive masons have frequently expressed concerns regarding the aims and objectives of Freemasonry and its contributions to modern society. There are those who feel the Craft has not kept pace with the times nor adjusted to the marvels of communication and technology; while others have expressed real concern for declining numbers and apparent apathy in certain aspects of our Fraternity.

We have all heard it before, and no matter what changes may be implemented, we will probably hear it again; therefore any proposed changes for improvement should not come about by an erosion or alteration of the basic tenets and principles upon which the Fraternity has been founded.

The Long Range Planning Committee, in its original mandate, put forth 12 important

---

\*The original proposal was submitted to the Chairman, R.W.Bro. H.O. Polk (now P.G.M.) of the Long Range Planning Committee, July 28th, 1980; some of the information was used by Bro. Pos in commenting on Bro. Thurtell's paper "MASONRY -SUBSTANCE OR SHADOW". This updated version was prepared by the Author in response to a motion passed in Lodge at the Regular Meeting, September 18, 1985.



issues for comment from the membership at large. The following proposals were originally offered as suggestions for discussion by the committee, and deal primarily with one issue 'The Organization of Grand Lodge' although 'Regalia' and 'Board Representation' are also touched upon.

My first concern stemmed from an uneasy awareness that appeared to predominate frequent discussions with senior members of the Craft, who were of the opinion that the organization of the Grand Lodge, which appeared to be democratic in structure and intent, had over the years evolved into something much more autocratic.

A typical example relates to the early development of our first 'Historical Lodge'. An attempt was made to obtain an audience with the Board of General Purposes to discuss the possibilities of Instituting a Historical Research Lodge in Ontario. The initial approach was made through normal channels by first contacting the D.D.G.M. We were subsequently, informally advised to discuss the proposal with a number of Past Grand Masters.

Eventually, I was invited to appear before a meeting of the "Grand East", in the Boardroom of the Memorial Building in Hamilton, Tuesday afternoon, 2:00 p.m. sharp, November 23, 1976. Those present consisted of the Grand Secretary, Deputy Grand Master and 5 Past Grand Masters. A package of information, containing organizational material, minutes of meetings, aims and objectives and alternative proposals, was mailed to all Past Grand Masters prior to the meeting. A very lengthy, negative letter was received from a Past Grand

Secretary, and we never did receive an audience with the Board of General Purposes.

Nevertheless, our determination and patience was rewarded, as history records, The Heritage Lodge No. 730 was eventually Constituted on September 23rd, 1978, by M.W.Bro. R.E. Davies, G.M., assisted by the Grand Secretary M.W.Bro. J. Irvine and the Officers of Grand Lodge. But the governing process remained unchanged, major decisions affecting Freemasonry in Ontario, were still being made by a body of senior masons who were not officially constituted, even in the newly revised Constitution of 1980. The situation came about through a process of evolution over a number of years perhaps by necessity and in the interest of efficiency and expediency.

In the beginning, it may have seemed unimportant to call a full meeting of the Board for an urgent matter but of minor significance, deeming it convenient and efficient to make a decision in the Grand Lodge Office with the assistance of the Grand Secretary and one or more Past Grand Masters who may perchance have been present at the time. Of course the Board was informed of the action taken at the earliest convenience. Speculating further, one would assume that over the years, the minor decisions would take on major proportions and the chance visits of P.G. Ms. had eventually become scheduled meetings of the "Grand East" rendering the Board of General Purposes redundant except for a number of routine administrative 'housekeeping' responsibilities.

The following recommendations were prompted in some measure as a response to the conditions that prevailed at the time, and a

concern for a more 'grass roots' involvement of more masons working for the benefit of Craft. From our experiences in Waterloo and Wellington Districts, the most important ingredient for the success of all our undertakings has been 'maximum participation'. In the production of the play "The Birth of our Grand Lodge" no fewer than 70 masons were involved on a voluntary basis contributing much time and effort for a single presentation. The Brethren worked very hard to make it successful and enjoyed their work because it had a purpose with clearly defined goals. Another example, that involved the entire Jurisdiction was the H.E.L.P. project; over 645 active participants from each lodge plus the overall organizing committee made it possible to more than double the original target figure of 300,000. And more recently, The Heritage Lodge raised more than \$130,000 for the restoration of a pre-confederation Lodge Room in the Black Creek Pioneer Village. Of course an important and essential catalyst is strong and dynamic leadership.

Freemasonry came to North America under the leadership of their respective mother Grand Lodge. Constituent Lodges in Upper and Lower Canada were warranted by the Grand Lodges of England, Ireland and Scotland. When a number of like lodges were established, they organized themselves into Provincial Grand Lodges. The first Provincial Grand Lodge in Upper Canada was formed at Niagara in 1792, with R.W.Bro. Wm. Jarvis as Provincial Grand Master. Other Provincial Grand Lodges had been formed and were being formed throughout the British Commonwealth and in Europe. Hence the concept of subordinate Grand Lodges under a specific Grand Lodge in the same country is not new and had its beginnings even before our



own Grand Lodge was formed in 1855.

In New Zealand for example, with a total civilian population equivalent to that of Metropolitan Toronto, there are approximately 40,000 masons registered in the Grand Lodge of New Zealand which is comprised of 13 regions or masonic districts. Each masonic geographic unit is governed by a Provincial Grand Master with the title of Right Worshipful Brother. In the organization of Grand Lodge, the Provincial Grand Masters are third in rank following the Most Worshipful the Grand Master and Right Worshipful the Deputy Grand Master. There are no District Deputy Grand Masters.

Having spent a year in the South Island from 1973 to 1974 and affiliated with two Lodges with the privilege of attending the Annual Communication of the Grand Lodge, I became somewhat familiar with the structure of the masonic region designated as Canterbury Province; the other 12 regions were designated as Districts each with a unique geographic prefix such as Auckland District and Otago District.

Canterbury Province has three levels of authority; first the 59 Craft Lodges each operating within its own geographic boundary, but with co-joint jurisdiction through a regional masonic bureau, second the Provincial Grand Lodge with its own compliment of Grand Lodge Officers which provides leadership and is in charge of the Annual Installation and Investiture Ceremonies, with assistance from the Craft Lodges, for each of the 59 Lodges in the region; and third the Grand Lodge of New Zealand. Following the work of the evening and before closing the lodge, Grand Lodge Officers are ceremonially retired,



then the Provincial Grand Lodge Officers are permitted to retire. The reverse order is followed when opening the Lodge. In addition, there are still a number of lodges in Canterbury Province and other Masonic Districts that are operating under warrants from the Grand Lodges of Scotland, Ireland and England that inter-visit regularly.

#### PROPOSAL FOR A PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE

The proposal for a Provincial Grand Lodge under the Grand Lodge of Canada in the Province of Ontario is not a new innovation in Freemasonry, but simply a revival of a procedure that historically has always been a part of our system.

The word 'Province' in this sense meaning a geographic unit of a larger jurisdiction. Essentially, the Jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Canada in the Province of Ontario would be divided into several geographic units or Provinces. The actual number would have to be properly researched to provide the most equitable and harmonious distribution. For the purpose of explanation and to invite discussion, I have chosen the basic masonic ruling number of three although holding it to five or expanding to a perfect seven are other considerations.

Using the statistics from the current (1985) Grand Lodge Proceedings, and arbitrarily assigning names for the three geographic units, an equitable distribution from west to east might appear as follows:

THE PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE  
OF SOUTH WESTERN ONTARIO

Comprising:

<u>DISTRICTS</u>		<u>LODGES</u>	<u>MASONS</u>
Brant		14	2080
Bruce		12	1095
Chatham		15	1781
Grey		12	1586
London East		14	2858
London West		14	2295
North Huron		12	1267
St. Thomas		11	1746
Sarnia		21	2750
South Huron		17	2297
Waterloo		17	2603
Wellington		11	1772
Wilson		23	2917
Windsor		19	2905
Totals	14	<u>211</u>	<u>29952</u>

THE PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE  
OF SOUTH CENTRAL ONTARIO

Comprising:

<u>DISTRICTS</u>	<u>LODGES</u>	<u>MASONS</u>
Hamilton A	14	2801
Hamilton B	14	2662
Hamilton C	14	2662
Niagara A	14	2504
Niagara B	14	2125
Toronto 1	23	3694
Toronto 2	19	3414
Toronto 3	17	3017
Toronto 4	18	3259
Toronto 5	16	2212
Toronto 6	16	2159
Toronto 7	26	3712
Victoria	14	1703
TOTALS 13	<u>219</u>	<u>35924</u>

THE PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE  
OF EASTERN & NORTHERN ONTARIO

Comprising:

<u>DISTRICTS</u>	<u>LODGES</u>	<u>MASONS</u>
Algoma	12	2251
Algoma East	8	1379
Eastern	20	1599
Frontenac	18	2466
Georgian	22	3588
Muskoka-Parry Sound	8	1212
Nipissing East	8	1216
Ontario	15	2904
Ottawa 1	16	2431
Ottawa 2	15	2416
Peterborough	12	2062
Prince Edward	17	3156
St. Lawrence	19	2237
Sudbury-Manitoulin	9	1413
Temiskaming	9	1232
Western	10	1373
Totals 16	<u>218</u>	<u>32935</u>
Grand Totals 43	650	98811



GRAND LODGES IN CANADA  
(Fraternal Reviews, 1985)

<u>PROVINCES</u>	<u>LODGES</u>	<u>MASONS</u>
Alberta	161	13949
British Columbia	172	21839
Manitoba	98	10221
New Brunswick	51	7396
New Foundland*		
Nova Scotia (1983)	116	10181
Ontario	650	98811
Prince Edward Island (1983)	16	1286
Quebec	101	10431
Saskatchewan	173	10712
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1538</b>	<b>184826</b>

\*New Foundland operates as a Provincial Grand Lodge under the Grand Lodge of England.

Each of the three proposed Provincial Grand Lodges in the Province of Ontario has more than double the total number of masons in each of the other Grand Lodges in Canada. Also, the Grand Lodge in the Province of Prince Edward Island has approximately the same total number of masons as each of the seven smallest Districts of our current Grand Jurisdiction.

Of the 27 Grand Lodges reported in the Fraternal Reviews (Grand Lodge Proceedings, 1985), 11 of them or more than 40% have fewer members than the smallest of the 3 proposed Provincial Grand Lodges, which may give justification for more than the 3 Provincial Grand Lodges initially proposed.

## PROPOSED PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE OFFICERS

R.W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Master  
R.W.Bro. the Deputy Provincial Grand  
Masters (15)  
R.W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Senior Warden  
R.W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Junior Warden  
V.W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Chaplain  
V.W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Treasurer  
V.W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Secretary  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Registrar  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Senior Deacon  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Junior Deacon  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Superintendant  
of Works  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Director of  
Ceremonies  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Sword Bearer  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Organist  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Pursuivant  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Historian  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Tyler  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Stewards (6)  
W.Bro. the Provincial Grand Standard  
Bearers (2)

This would also allow greater opportunity for more participation by opening 25 or more new positions (the present D.D.G.Ms. would become D.P.G.Ms) for each proposed Provincial Grand Lodge. Normally there would be over 200 Worshipful Masters installed each year in each of the three proposed regions and approximately the same number of I.P.Ms are subsequently added to the list of Past Masters; therefore, there should be an abundance of talent available to adequately fill the new positions proposed for each Provincial Grand Lodge.

There are those who would suggest that the proposal merely introduces another level of administration which would compound the present bureaucracy, and further decrease the efficiency of a central administration. My personal response is that our present system has not kept pace with advancing technologies in rapid data collection, assimilation, storage, retrieval and dissemination. The current postal system in causing long and costly delays in written communications, and our own central administration is apparently becoming more remote from the grass-roots of Freemasonry.

Even if there should be, perchance, some minor duplication in procedure, it would be a small price to pay for the long term benefits of a more efficient computerized network system. The rapid advances, greater capacity and reduced costs in the home and small business computer market has made affordable network systems available to all.

Such a system, initially, could connect the permanent offices of the three Provincial Grand Lodges to the Grand Lodge Office in the Masonic Memorial Building in Hamilton by high speed and error free optic transmissions, and eventually, by portable or desk top units to each district in the Grand Jurisdiction.

Also, this could give individual lodges within the districts, by means of coded passwords, ready access at all times to available information and to allow the immediate transfer of data, semi-annual returns, reports and special requests; thereby providing a more direct and expedient link between the basic component of our structural organization and its governing bodies.

Should the formation of three Provincial Grand Lodges become a reality, then conceivably, London, Toronto and Ottawa could become the Masonic Capitals of their respective Regions. Further, if on the average, each mason in each Region were to loan or donate an average of \$25.00 per year for 5 years, then over 4 million dollars would be available to commence construction of a new Masonic Building or Appropriate Facility in each of the three Masonic Capitals.

Hopefully, each beautifully architected structure would include space and facilities not only for essential lodge meeting rooms, but also for major social events as well as a regional library and museum. The mistake should not be made of building a single purpose building, such as the Masonic Temple at 888 Yonge St., Toronto, or the Masonic Temple at 2295 St. Mark St., Montreal; but rather a multi-use, income producing structure perhaps connected with a large business complex, convention center, shopping mall, hotel or apartments with ample parking facilities, so as not to impose a financial burden to future generations of masons.

#### PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE REGALIA

The jewels of office should be the same as those of Grand Lodge and its Constituent Lodges; but the collars and aprons should be a distinctive colour and design appropriate for the Provincial Grand Lodge. They should be simple in design, and not as elaborately ornamented as the regalia of Grand Lodge.

Manufacturers of masonic regalia have,



over the years, made it much too pretentious and costly, particularly the Grand Lodge regalia. By staying with the Craft Lodge apron of a Past Master and simply replacing the blue satin border with a similar border of a different colour and adding a cotton embroidered office symbol in the center of the apron should be adequate. The cost of converting a Past Master's apron would be very reasonable and the standard carrying case could still be used.

If a collar and jewel is required, then a plain soft collar, similar to the border of the apron is sufficient. It could be folded flat and carried in the apron case. The distinction between current rank and past rank is that the former wear the collar and jewel, which is passed on to their successor and remains the property of the Provincial Grand Lodge (which is the practice in Craft lodges), and the latter would continue to wear the apron only.

This would be an interesting assignment and challenge for a new Committee to be styled 'The Regalia Committee' which would also continue to watch over the needs of our Fraternity and police the manufacturers. This would also remove the responsibility from the manufacturers and place it back in the hands of the Fraternity where it belongs.

#### ADMINISTRATION

I have purposely left this subject to the last so that it can be tied in with recommendations for changes to the present organization of Grand Lodge. To avoid confusion between the administrative structure

of the two bodies, I shall refer to the general meeting of Grand Lodge as the COMMUNICATION OF GRAND LODGE and the Provincial body as the PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE CONVENTION. The governing bodies shall be identified as the BOARD OF GENERAL PURPOSES (Grand Lodge) and GOVERNING COUNCIL (Provincial Grand Lodge).

### PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE

A 'Provincial Grand Lodge Convention' would be held every two years (alternating with the Communication of Grand Lodge), at which time the Provincial Grand Lodge Officers with the exception of the Deputy Provincial Grand Masters, would be elected by written ballot after declared and approved nominations have been publicized in much the same manner as in the present Constitution for Grand Lodge. Provincial Grand Lodge Officers would be Installed and Invested and hold office for two years. Vacancies would be filled by appointment until the next regular election. The Deputy Provincial Grand Masters would be elected within their respective Districts not less than 60 days before the Provincial Grand Lodge Convention.

The composition of the 'Governing Council' shall include one representative from each masonic district within the Provincial Region plus 5 additional members appointed by the Provincial Grand Master. In addition, certain designated offices of the Provincial Grand Lodge shall also be members of the Governing Council. A voting majority of the seats should be with the District Representatives in order to insure a grass roots system of government. Half of the

District Representatives should be elected every year and serve for a two year term. District Representatives may be re-elected and other members of the Governing Council may be re-appointed. No person can serve more than three consecutive terms unless by virtue of an elected office in the Provincial Grand Lodge.

District Representatives would be elected by secret ballot at a Regular District Meeting, properly publicized to every mason, within the District through the Lodge Secretaries at least 14 days prior to the meeting at which the ballot is to be taken. This will also apply to the election of the Deputy Provincial Grand Master every other year. The results of the election are to be transmitted, in a prescribed manner and verified by the District Chairman or President, to the office of the Provincial Grand Secretary at least 6 weeks prior to the date of the Provincial Grand Lodge Convention.

Standing and appointed committees, which are necessary for the operation, maintenance and future planning of the Provincial Grand Lodge, shall be responsible to the Governing Council. The Chairman of each such committee shall be a member of the Governing Council; non council members may be added to certain committees with the approval of the Governing Council.

By-Laws or Letters Patent for the Provincial Grand Lodge would have to be drafted outlining the structure of the Provincial Grand Lodge, election, appointment, duties and responsibilities of Officers and Committees; types, frequency and dates or times of meetings; and other matters relevant to the operation and maintenance of the



Provincial Grand Lodge; and that it fully acknowledges the supremacy of the Grand Lodge A.F. & A.M. of Canada, in the Province of Ontario and, will at all times pay due respect and obedience to its laws, rules and regulations. That is, assuming that the Constitution of Grand Lodge has been restructured and amended to provide for the formation and operation of Provincial Grand Lodges.

## GRAND LODGE

Much of what has been suggested thus far concerning organization, regalia and government applies to Grand Lodge as well. However, if a revised structure should permit the formation of Provincial Grand Lodges, then much of the cost of administration will have to be transferred to the Provincial Regions; and the current procedure of semi-annual returns to the Grand Lodge will not be necessary, as the Craft Lodges will be reporting directly to the Provincial Grand Lodge, with the latter submitting returns to the Grand Lodge on an annual basis. Therefore, the present fee structure will have to be modified accordingly.

At current operating costs (which may have to be adjusted upward to accommodate the new proposal), each Lodge may be required to contribute \$1.50 per member with their semi-annual returns to the office of the Provincial Grand Lodge of which approximately 75 cents would be retained, and the balance of \$1.50 on an annual basis, would be paid to the Grand Lodge with the annual report. A less desirable alternative or temporary arrangement would have the individual Lodges reporting



direct to the Grand Lodge, as is the current practice, and grants paid on a per capita basis to the Provincial Grand Lodges. However, while this may be a simple and expedient transition, it would usurp authority from the Provincial Grand Lodge and not be in the best interests of the Craft in the long term.

Grand Lodge would continue to administer the major charitable and benevolent activities of the Craft, ensure uniformity of the work, approve design of regalia and administrative procedures, adjudicate grievances and appeals, and provide the necessary leadership for the welfare of the Craft in Ontario. All matters concerning Freemasonry with other Grand Lodges throughout the world will continue to be processed through the office of Grand Lodge.

The unofficial concept of the 'Grand East' can be made to serve a very useful purpose. The combined experiences of the Past Grand Masters should be exploited for the benefit of Freemasons in general and in particular for special assignments. They should be legally constituted, and styled somewhat after the Senate in the Federal Government and perhaps designated the Senatorial Board, but without veto power.

The major activities and principal support for the Grand Master should reside with the Board of General Purposes. The composition of the 'Board' should include elected representatives from the Provincial Grand Lodges who should control the majority of the votes. Other members would include appointments by the Grand Master and certain designated offices of Grand Lodge; for example; the Deputy Grand Master as Chairman

or President and the Grand Secretary as Secretary of the Board.

Half of the Provincial Grand Lodge Representatives should be elected each year and hold office for 2 years. Members of the Board may be re-elected and/or re-appointed, but may not serve more than three consecutive terms except by virtue of being elected to a designated office in Grand Lodge.

The foregoing proposals and comments are presented, not as a criticism of our present operational procedure which from its original conception over 250 years has served a very useful purpose, but simply as suggestions to add further refinement to our present system. While these proposals may appear to depart from established custom the precedents have been well established, although they have not been used in recent years.

It was necessary to introduce some specific details purely for illustrative purposes, they are not engraved in stone and can be modified easily to accommodate changing circumstances. The primary objective of this presentation is to outline a general philosophy for further discussion. Should any of these suggestions receive general support, then more serious work will be required to finalize the details and test the reactions. Nevertheless, a fresh approach has been outlined with the hope of re-activating the interest of individual masons and perhaps attracting new members.

Respectfully submitted

R.W.Bro. J. Pos.

## **FIDELITY, FIDELITY, FIDELITY, - BUT TO WHAT?**

An assessment of Freemasonry\*

by

Bro. The Hon. John R. Matheson Q.C.

"God Himself hopes for and in man; has placed His eternal hope in man's hands, and given to him, along with the gift of liberty, the terrible power of frustrating or achieving the purposes of Divine Love."

CHARLES PEGUY

## **FIDELITY, FIDELITY, FIDELITY, - BUT TO WHAT?**

This is an attempt on the part of a longtime backbencher to assess the very essence of freemasonry. I have no particular axe to grind nor authority to defend. For over forty-five years I have rejoiced in fraternal companionship, watching far better artisans than I do the ritualistic work and make all important decisions whereby masons govern the Craft.

---

\*Paper presented at the Second Annual Heritage Banquet of The Heritage Lodge, held in the Visitors Centre, Black Creek Pioneer Village, Toronto, January 30th, 1986.

In SPIRITUS MUNDI Northrop Frye opens with a chapter he entitled "The Search for Acceptable Words", which expresses my anxious state of mind in exposing my ingenious cogitations before such an elitist audience. I take guarded comfort in Dr. Frye's assurance that every creative person possesses some useful interconnected body of images and ideas underneath consciousness which it is his duty to fish up from time to time.

Should I apologise for suggesting that I may be creative? The mason knows that behind all things is a Divine Architect who made all things good, even myself. He made Man in his own image, that is in the image of an artist. As an intimate fellowship "we are fond together", as T.E. Lawrence once phrased it, precisely because freemasons feel under no compulsion to agree. I know in charity you will hear me out, and then accept or reject whatever I say without hating me for it. Or better still you will ponder my metaphors, and then develop them into something much more finished and worthy of your own.

So, the wind from my lips bloweth where it listeth, and I will not dare to predict whither it goeth. In deep appreciation of your incomparable kindness in inviting me, I venture forth.

What I presume to offer as my understanding of masonry is garnered as much from non-masonic sources as from anything I have learned in lodge. My authorities tend to be blurred. Much of the stimulating and substantial masonic scholarship today comes from persons outside of our recognized obediences, and, indeed, from non-masons who are predisposed to masonic lore and



memorabilia.

One is mindful of the haughty inscription over Marischal College in Aberdeen, "They say, What say they? Let them say!" Such a posture would be sheer affectation. We masons, coveting "the tongue of good report", do care what writers say about us.

Recognizing that freemasonry is not homogeneous, that it derives from ancient learning, as well as from many diverse traditions, is it possible to discover what is essential and fundamental in its philosophy, - to probe its *raison d'etre*?

Masonry is founded upon confidence in the dignity of Man. Its monumental contribution to western civilization results from a fierce attachment to liberty and to individual conscience. We see here the classic Aristotelian balance, freedom and control.

Despite all the heroic affirmations on human rights and freedoms, as he approaches the 21st Century, modern man is less than sure that he enjoys any meaningful degree of choice. He has come to believe that freedom is more a cherished theory than reality. The behavioural sciences suggest mankind is governed less by moral judgement and will, and more by the dictates of powerful internal and external forces, - genetic, psychological, environmental, economic and military.

Many young people despair of any real measure of freedom.

Two determinist theories, Freudian and Marxist, dominate the thinking of this world. Both are inimical to the idea of freedom or

its concomitant, personal moral responsibility. True freedom cannot survive without morality, and morality itself presupposes freedom. Without choice the word virtue has no relevance or meaning.

The initiate to the Craft learns that freemasonry rests upon the practice of social and moral virtue. He is invested with an apron as a badge of innocence to symbolize purity of life, that he may stand finally before his Maker undefiled by vice or sin. Masonry, a system of ethics based upon freedom and upon personal moral responsibility, is an anomaly in our time. Freemasonry has been characterized as "the religion of the enlightenment". Out of the brooding mysticism of the dark ages emerges the awareness that man is master of his own destiny, capable of controlling the world and its government. Our brother Giuseppe Mazzini, whom the British historian Trevelyan described as "the noblest of the many exiles then sheltering in our island", caught the masonic vision of the portion of mankind in his dramatic phrase,

"One sole God;  
One sole ruler, - his Law;  
One sole interpreter of the law -  
Humanity."

The importance of freedom is inherent in the allegory of a Great Architect, who, Dr. James Anderson told us, "created all things very good, and according to Geometry, last of all formed Adam after his own image..." Once having created the earth the Architect placed Man in charge laden with large and onerous responsibilities. He was left free but with accountability.

The motto of the Right Honourable Roland Michener is "libre et ordonne", free and bound. The mason treasures his right to think for himself and believe what he will. And the mason is bound, - by the strictest demands of moral conduct.

My home lodge is True Britons Lodge #14. In perusing the early minutes and proceedings I have been intrigued with the number of charges, reprimands, warnings and apologies that appear during 1819 and throughout the 1820s relating to unacceptable behaviour. If a brother failed to measure up to the masonic expectations, even within the precincts of his own home, the brethren were zealous to investigate, to admonish, "to place him under censure until he should find grace", and finally, if he did not shape up and repair his ways, to expel him from the lodge.

Returning to our medieval beginnings, Professor Durant tells us that in every city in western Europe there were established meeting places where men of different social occupations and social classes, different religious persuasions, different political opinions, even different nationalities could meet in goodwill and exchange ideas. Under the "cloak of secrecy" and oath of confidentiality men felt free to congregate and discover the wonder of one another. In a society demanding a great deal of conformity this freedom to communicate was tremendously exciting. Security for this intercourse depended upon secrecy.

Not an end in itself, secrecy was the best means that our early brothers had to protect a climate of unconstraint.

A large part of the fascination of freemasonry was in the variety of interchange that it afforded. Freedom is well on its way when man realizes that he has much to learn from his brother, that all that he can ever hope to see from his own small window is an infinitesimal part of the whole.

What relationship pertains between freemasonry and religion? Religion may be defined as the belief in a God, and in particular a personal God, and in faith and worship. It is paradoxical that masonry, a system of morality, has counted among its most ardent enemies many of the good people. Eric Hoffer characterizes those of any fanatical faith as "the true believers". These include devout people of rigid and crystallized religious convictions.

Perhaps this is not surprising. Some men of God sincerely oppose the Craft on doctrinal grounds. If one is certain that he possesses "the true milk of the word", why get contaminated by those who do not? "Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?"

And some clergy, of broader view, believe that too many masons make lodge their church and thereby escape the discipline of regular worship and stewardship. One Presbyterian minister stated this to me a few days ago. I tried, unsuccessfully, to persuade him that lodge and church were mutually supportive, that masonry may be regarded as "the handmaiden to religion."

But, do they sometimes crowd one another



on the same road? Religion is essentially a belief in a Supreme Being. Masonry is in accord. Religion is concerned with ethical conduct. Masonry is a system of morality. Religion promises eternal life. Masonry is preoccupied with the journey of life as preparation for the ultimate adventure of dying, - what our French friends refer to as a passage from light, to darkness, to greater light. They call it "Renaissance". Would freemasonry not constitute at least some near form of higher religion?

Freemasonry is far more threatening to those of the faithful whose belief system is ultra orthodox. The Roman Catholic who is convinced that all others are destined for hell, the "born again" Protestant with certitude of scripture, the fanatic Muslim or Hasidic Jew, - all these devout people are simply not masonic material. Even some Anglican, Lutheran and Methodist leaders in recent years have voiced strong opposition to masonry. We, who revere the Royal Family, are much saddened by the Queen Mother's unsympathetic view of the Craft based, we are given to believe, upon religious qualms.

Some people are distressed by any theological speculation.

As I was preparing this paper, whose primary theme is freedom, I chanced to catch on television a passionate appeal for funds to endow a new American Protestant university. It was to be "The Notre Dame of Fundamentalism". The object was to ensure that the true Christian believer was no second class citizen; that, equipped with all requisite higher degrees, he might enter the portals of power and remake America. The

evangelist, who promoted this fifty million dollar appeal, promised that the faculty would be screened to ensure that no person would teach at LIBERTY UNIVERSITY who did not believe that the Bible was infallible, that Christ was God, and in free enterprise.

He promised there would be no security of tenure lest some professor turned out to be a liberal. Every teacher and every student allowed at LIBERTY must be a born-again Christian!

Tom Paine once despaired that all religions, though in their nature kind and benign, tended in the fullness of time to lose their native mildness and become morose and intolerant.

In discussing the dialectic of belief and vision, Northrop Frye recently distinguished between faith and "professed faith". He considered words signifying belief as of negligible value; faith in God and brother man could be expressed only in action.

A century ago the works of John Ruskin were familiar to almost anyone of cultivated taste. He had the insight and spirit of a speculative mason. In an address to The Royal Institute of British Architects in 1865, he spoke of superstition and religion in words that bear repeating today:

"Let me carefully define the difference. Superstition in all times and among all nations, is the fear of a spirit whose passions are those of a man, whose acts are the acts of a man; who is present in some places, not in others; who makes some places holy, and not others; who is kind to one

person, unkind to another; who is pleased or angry according to the degree of attention you pay to him, or praise you refuse to him; who is hostile generally to human pleasure, but may be bribed by sacrifice of a part of that pleasure into permitting the rest. This, whatever form of faith it colours, is the essence of superstition."

In a moment I wish to draw some comparison of these thoughts to the theology of Professor Hans Kung. Consider first what Ruskin, a monumental authority in aesthetics, has to say as to the nature of religion. He writes:

"And religion is the belief in a Spirit whose mercies are over all His works - who is kind even to the unthankful and the evil; who is everywhere present, and therefore is in no place to be sought, and in no place to be evaded; to whom all creatures, times and things are everlastingly holy, and who claims - not tithes of wealth, nor sevenths of days - but all the wealth that we have, and all the days that we live, and all the beings that we are, but who claims that totality because He delights only in the delight of His creatures; and because, therefore, the one duty that we owe to Him, and the only service they can render Him is to be Happy."

Have we not heard those words before?

Ruskin goes on to describe his own King of Kings and Lord of Lords:

"A Spirit, therefore, whose eternal benevolence cannot be angered, cannot be appeased; whose laws are everlasting and inexorable, so that heaven and earth must

indeed pass away if one jot of them failed: laws which attach to every wrong and error a measured, inevitable penalty; to every rightness and prudence, an assured reward."

At times the mason has been accused of being Deist. French masonic material seems to suffer in the translation into English. I believe much of our misunderstanding is idiomatic, and flows from English inability to cope with subtleties of the French language. The word "atheist" may encompass a very wide terrain. Freemasonry, generally, conceives of a Grand Geometrician far far greater than the religions that worship him. And masonry believes man to be cast in the image of God and subject only to Him. As Lorne Pierce put it one half century ago, the whole purpose of masonry is to exemplify an exalted point of view, a noble way of looking at life and living it grandly. This means to place man just "a little lower than the angels".

Religion and freemasonry are not exactly the same. In religion man uplifts his arms to God. In masonry man extends his arms to all mankind. But, as Bishop Wright has so wisely observed, these are very nearly the same postures.

Masonry must remain at odds with religious intolerance, as well as with intolerance of any other nature or kind. Masonry rejoices however in any heartfelt expression of faith however simple or sophisticated that may be. Consider this moving and unconditional affirmation by our brother, Donald Fleming, to the Toronto Telegram on April 9, 1955:

"Religion is the most vital and intimate



factor in life. It embraces every relationship. It gives life meaning, perspective and proportion.

Religion sustains my belief that:  
God is my Creator, and I am his child.  
His other children are my brothers.  
Love is the Law of life, and peace is its path, for all men are my neighbours.  
God's grace is sufficient for my needs, however unworthy I prove.  
My soul is eternal. God did not create it to let it die...  
Religion to me means Jesus Christ, Son of the Living God, my Saviour."

Recently, in Toronto, the scholar priest Hans Kung addressed the subject "Is There One True Religion?" Declaring himself to be the Holy Father's "loyal opposition", he suggested that there were four possible answers:

(1) There is ONE true religion, and all other religions are false.

(2) There is NO true religion, and all religions are false.

(3) There are a number of religions and all are equally true.

(4) There is actually only ONE true religion, and the religious beliefs of mankind are true only to the extent and degree that they conform to that fundamental truth.

For Dr. Kung, as for Donald Fleming and myself, there is the way of the Master. But Kung would not deny that for others the path of grace might be by other means. He noted many similar characteristics of the so-called higher religions, with respect to ethics, respect for the Creator and all his creatures. Like Dr. Frye, he thought a religion must be

judged by its service to the human race.

I was born in 1917, during the dire month of Passchendaele. During my lifetime there have been bitter enemies of the Craft.

Among the most vehement of these was the German nationalist, General Erich Ludendorff, the chief originator of the Jewish-Masonic international conspiracy theory. He distrusted those who could see some virtue in the enemy, the "masonic mentality" that put together the League of Nations and later the United Nations.

During the same period there were the dialecticians of the Left who feared masonry as a social bridge that might develop a climate of understanding between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the oppressor and the oppressed. Communists wanted nothing to interfere with the impending explosion in Russia.

We remember that among the first victims of Adolph Hitler's savagery were our brother masons. We recall the treachery and ruthlessness of Bernard Fay. Nor will we be able to forget the shameful collaboration of Field-Marshal Petain of France who joined Hitler in some cruel repressive ventures. My attitude towards masons of the Grand Orient of France will forever be influenced by the heroism of the many who served with the Free French forces of deGaulle and also in the French underground.

I was astonished to be told, in lodge in Strasbourg by a German brother, that Hitler had actually applied for initiation to some lodge in Austria and had been rejected. The

trials of Ernst Zundel and Jim Keegstra in 1985 served to remind us of the inherent conflict between the Nazi outlook and our own masonic ideal of universal brotherhood. In recent years I have made two pilgrimages to infamous death camps in Europe. I pray never to forget how precious and vital are the values of human dignity and freedom, of common goodness and kindness. In Bergen-Belsen are incised the words of little Anne Franck before she perished:

"I believe there is some good in every human being".

From its earliest days masonry has sought to promote the spiritual quality of life in order to prepare with anticipation for what is yet to come. Some of the most elegiac music by our brothers Mozart, Haydn and Sibelius relate to the march towards the Great Light. It seems most natural for military people to think seriously and calmly about death; and this is one of the reasons why, for them, freemasonry has had profound appeal.

By way of example, - Sir Robert Moray: Moray was admitted into masonry in 1641 by an Edinburgh Lodge at Newcastle where he was serving as a general officer with the occupying army of the covenanters. He and his fellow initiate, General Alexander Hamilton, were artillery officers, "highly skilled in geometry". This founder of the Royal Society, according to a recent study by David Stevenson, displayed extraordinary openness of mind to all things, and not least, to things of the spirit. His curiosity, thirst for knowledge and hunger for ever greater light became the identifying impulses of his Royal Society, which was distinctly masonic in

objective. Robert Moray's mason's mark was chosen with exquisite care. It was the pentacle, or star, and it was appropriate because Moray was greatly interested in astrology astronomy, and in navigation. But, he was likewise fascinated with the spiritual implications of the star. In his mark the pentacle was surrounded by the letters A G A P A which Moray employed as the basis for an acrostic which conveyed a message.

"Love God and your fellow men; Know thyself; Be constant; Have faith; Be temperate."

The allegory of the search is repeated throughout all of masonry, and its attendant orders, and the search is never fully satisfied. It would be devastating were we to find ourselves in full possession of the final word or truth. The vision of growth, pilgrimage and perfection would dissolve and disappear.

Many artillery officers, skilled in the art of ballistics, that is to say in the science of geometry, have been masonic enthusiasts. These include Napoleon Bonaparte who was recognized as a brother at St. Helena by his British captors, as his grave attests, and that superb commander of World War 2, Field-Marshal the Right Honorable Lord Alexander of Tunis.

I wonder if this learned audience knows that both Wolfe and Montcalm, who died at Quebec in 1759, were freemasons.

"Valour gave them a common death  
History a common fame  
Posterity a common monument"



The handsome obelisk to their eternal memory, close by the Chateau Frontenac, was laid by Lord Dalhousie in 1828. In the ceremony he was assisted by the sole surviving veteran of the battle of the Plains of Abraham, of either the French or British armies, Worshipful Brother James Thompson, then 96 years old.

This tribute, conceived by Thompson and St. Andrew's Lodge, a lodge incidentally which Thompson served some fourteen times as Master, stands forever as eloquent testimony of fraternal love.

James Thompson was a native of Tain near Dornoch in Ross and Cromarty, and there he was made a mason, an Ancient. He served in His Majesty's 78th Regiment of Foot, the famous Fraser Highlanders, who scaled the steep heights and then fought to win.

My distinguished friend, Leon Patenaude of Montreal, who is an ambulatory treasure trove of masonic lore and musicology, tells me that a considerable number of the officers on both sides were masons, including Montcalm's deputy, the Marquis de Levis.

After peace was restored, happily under a benign occupation, some of the military wished to get back to masonry. Three master masons applied to their commanding officer, the Right Worshipful Colonel Simon Fraser, on October 20, 1760, requesting a warrant for holding a lodge. Those of you familiar with the formality and bureaucracy of the Craft will be enchanted to learn that these three worthies obtained their warrant very promptly and opened to commence fraternal work just two

days later.

This was no fly-by-night lodge. Records in the Milborne Collection in the Public Archives in Ottawa attest to some 397 meetings. St. Andrew's Lodge continued to function until after the arrival of His Royal Highness the Duke of Kent in 1792.

The minutes of September 1783 show visitors hailing from lodges known to be Ancients. A.J.B. Milborne explains that our brethern in Quebec had very little conception of the wide breach that existed in the Craft in England. Their rites and ceremonies were derived from Ireland and Scotland and these they continued to practice. Control from the Grand Lodge of England (the Moderns) appears to have been very loose at the time.

Thompson had no time whatever for jurisdictional quarrels. In his lodge were many Scots of Jacobite background, and there were others who were Hanoverians. James Wolfe and "the Fighting Frasers" had met on the Field of Culloden, in 1746, on opposite sides. When the highlanders had been crushed by greatly superior artillery, Cumberland ordered they be put to the sword. Wolfe, with great courage, refused to obey this unjust command. He thereby earned the everlasting loyalty and devotion of the Clan. Later when hardy and intrepid men were required to fight in North America Wolfe sought them from the mountains of the North. Simon Fraser was commissioned Lieut. Colonel Commandant of the 78th Regiment of 2nd Highland Battalion of Foot on January 5, 1757.

Not only did members of St. Andrew's Lodge serve against the French, in 1775 some

brethern assisted in repulsing the American invaders. Worshipful Master James Thompson has provided a most detailed account of the actual slaying of General Montgomery by one of the brethern on the night of December 31, 1775. Other brethern dispersed with artillery fire the attacking forces of Colonel Benedict Arnold. We note that the ill-fated Colonel Barry St. Leger was initiated into the lodge in 1778.

The box of fraternal assistance was an important instrument of social welfare. It is touching to read the records of monies advanced, to an abandoned American rebel, to numerous widows and orphans, and to ex-soldiers down on their luck. I read of a gift to some gentle Sister of Charity who had earned their devotion. Charity, caritas, - or affection, love, esteem, that is masonry!

There were jolly times too; it was not all ritual. It appears there were nine regular toasts drunk in an evening, three times three. After the toast to the King and the Craft there would follow toasts to the jurisdictions of the world. Finally, as chivalry surely demands, before returning home the brave brethern would drink one long last one to their fortunate wives!

Having enjoyed fraternal hospitality in sundry far away places since 1940 I cannot understand how masonry can be confined by language or nationality or politics or by any other creature.

In considering this question of fidelity, just how important is secrecy? Dr. Albert G. Mackey, writing over sixty years ago, discusses the Aristotelian virtues of secrecy

and silence, and refers to them as "the very essence of all Masonic character". He asks: "What are the aporrheta of Freemasonry? What are the arcana of which there can be no disclosure?" I find his answers not altogether clear. He recognizes that French or German masons, unlike the English or Americans, will discuss almost anything. American writers of his period seem to have insisted that modes of recognition and ceremonies must never be revealed.

What about today? Much of the current trash now published focuses upon this aspect of secrecy, the hidden motive, the international plot or conspiracy, the corrupting intrigue. We recognize that the political climate of our times is highly inimical to secrecy. Current legal mores encourages openness.

After all, what is the masonic secret? The answer given to any query from an outsider is generally opaque like the answer to the monk who enquired of Tung-shan, "Who is the Buddha?" Whereupon he was met with the answer "Three measures of flax".

The secret of masonry is as elusive as the secret of Zen. When the neophyte demanded to know the Great Secret he was met with the counter query, "What did your face look like before your parents begot you", or the even more arresting response of a sharp clapping of the hands, and the question, "What sound does one hand make?"

In this I find the glimmer of an answer. Years ago Lorne Pierce wrote, "The secret of Freemasonry is that there is no secret." But he also wrote something else to the effect



that everyone must evolve the meaning of Freemasonry for himself. This is in keeping with Mackey's more extensive definition. "Masonry is commitment to the continuing search after Divine Truth."

Alec Mellor cites secrecy as the fundamental cause of the condemnations by the Holy Mother Church. Mellor concludes:

The time is ripe to make a clean sweep of everything which has managed to harm the masonic ideal. A kind of young freemasonry is feeling its way. This explosion of generosity will not be short-lived; it deserves to be followed with the most sympathetic attention." Thus speaks a devout Catholic who wishes us well. A surprising number of Quebecers share his sentiments. I think the time is ripe for a greater openness.

Our supposed secrets have been revealed many times from the days of John Coustos and his torture. Even the most professional security systems of Russia, Britain and America fail in keeping secrets, - vital secrets. It has been suggested that it is timely to produce, under official auspices, an authoratative, scholarly and complete compendium of all our symbolics. Jules Boucher believes the availability to the world of such material would serve to remove the stigma of secrecy, awaken widespread interest, and stimulate serious masons to even greater labours.

Without sacrifice of any words of ritual surely we have the wit in lectures to make it even more clear that masonry will not countenance conspiracy, plotting, intrigue or any self interest.

The late Stephen Knight made a tidy profit by vicious libel of the order in JACK THE RIPPER : THE FINAL SOLUTION, and by his "Sensational Revelations" in THE BROTHERHOOD. These works were founded upon imaginary corruption and crime conducted under the cloak of masonic secrecy. Just imagine what Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, a member of Pheonix Lodge, and a gentleman with a passion for integrity and fair play, would say were he to learn that his own Sherlock Holmes had unmasked the most horrendous of Victorian sex crimes and had laid them all at the door of freemasonry. For good measure Knight attributes leadership in this conspiracy to the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite!

This benighted author dies at the age of thirty-three after five years of a developing brain tumour. I deplore that Ottawa subsidized the motion picture sequel, MURDER BY DECREE, through income tax write-offs. This movie, shocking to many of our wives and families, libels a deceased heir to the throne, and deceased British Privy Councillors, as well as the Craft in general.

We have been maligned and victimized because we suffer the reputation of being a secret society. Perhaps as important, by holding our cards too tightly to our chest we have forgotten the wealth we hold in our hand. Secrecy is corrosive to the Order.

Dr. Pierce once remarked that masonry has triumphed when its work was least occult. He was convinced that it would recover its former glory when it steps boldly into the open.

He is right. Masonry has a vital message

for our times, for Canada and for all of humanity. Masonry is committed to freedom and morality and whatsoever will elevate and dignify the human race. We should allow no ground for suspicion otherwise.

Charles Morgan thought that each man must enquire of himself in what work, in what human company, in what loyalty his own voice appears most clear. For my grandfather, my father and for my own self, this type of intimate companionship that you and I have shared here tonight has afforded the richest liberation, fulfilment and happiness.

As you drive home will you ponder the thoughts of that genius, Blaise Pascal, who died in 1662 at thirty years of age. Professor John North describes him as Newton's great forerunner in the establishment of calculus. This brilliant "geometrician" is remarkable for the wholeness of his vision. Pascal once wrote that in Jesus Christ is the coherence of all human experience, a source of satisfaction for the mind to which even mathematics points.

Some brethren may not agree. Freemasons are never under compulsion to agree. But all of you, I know, will delight in his Pensees 620, which has the appearance of a masonic credo.

"Man is obviously made for thinking. Therein lies all his dignity and his merit; and his whole duty is to think as he ought. Now the order of thought is to begin with ourselves, and with our author and our end."

If the hill is high enough all things are seen to come together. I know because I have

climbed some of the highest peaks in Sicily and Italy as an artillery forward observation officer.

I wrote this masonic prayer in 1944 after I had been wounded in those hills. With it I bid you, my dear brethren, a grateful farewell.

#### FASHION THUS THY CRAFTSMAN

Oh God, let no day die of wasting doubts or fears;  
Guide this soul's struggle skyward crag to crag  
Until upon some summit, vista free,  
It scans beyond and from Thy breezes hears  
Whisperings of Man's truth.

Fulfil this urge for loftier sight Oh God;  
Quicken, strengthen, this poor mind and then  
'Twill scramble down the crags, reford the  
the streams,

Rejoin with pride this favoured breed of men.  
We are besotted, human pawn of passion,  
ignorance and lust  
Yet sill courageous, still beset with dreams.

John Ross Matheson



## THE HISTORY OF HUNGARIAN MASONRY\*

by

V.W.Bro. Emery I Gero

In the heart of Central Europe there is a small country, Hungary. Its territory is less than 36,000 square miles, not even 1/10 of the size of Ontario. The population exceeds 10 million -- about the size of this province's present population. The Magyars occupied that land in A.D. 895 and kept it, in spite of several foreign invasions, occupations and influences.

It has been characteristic of the almost two and half centuries of Hungarian Freemasonry, that the lodges could operate only for short periods of months or years, between long years of silence. These early centuries of Hungarian history were a continuous struggle between the autocracy of the Austrian Hapsburg Emperor and the determination of the Hungarian people to be free and independent. During the first 200 years, the only peaceful period of improvement was the era of Emperor Francis Joseph, in the last fifty years before World War I. Apart from that Masons were able to meet only informally, that is without any ritual or degree work in order to keep alive the friendly and brotherly spirit of Masonry, and

---

\*Paper presented at the Regular Meeting at the Heritage Lodge held in the Barrie Masonic Temple, Barrie, Ontario, Hosted by Corinthian Lodge No. 96, March 19th, 1986.

on such occasions the older generation introduced philosophic and humane ideas to the younger idealists.

Old excavations and documents prove that there were early lodges belonging to Masonic guilds, but these lodges never became freemasonic lodges.

The English form of Masonry, codified by James Anderson in 1723, reached Hungary through Austria, Germany, France and Poland, where travelling Hungarian noblemen learned the new ideas of humanity and freedom.

The first Freemasonic Lodge in Hungary was founded in Brasso, Transylvania, in 1749 by Saxon inhabitants of German origin, followed by other lodges also in Transylvania between 1750 and 1770. There were early attempts in the forties and fifties, under Austrian influence in Pozsony, the parliamentary city of Hungary at that time, but the first lodge did not come into being until 1775. The first members of these lodges were officers of the army and government, higher clerical personalities, physicians, lawyers, judges, etc.

Masonry also spread to Croatia, and to the Northern and Southern Territory. In Buda and Pest Masonry started around 1770 with military lodges; it achieved great vitality in the time of Grand Master Count Draskovich, who actually lived in Pest for several years. In 1781 the lodges in Buda had a very illustrious visitor, the Crown Prince of Russia, later Czar Paul I.

In 1781 the lodges declared the union of Austrian and Hungarian Masonry; and, under

M.W.Bro. Count Carl Palffy, they organized the first Hungarian Provincial Grand Lodge. This new Grand Lodge was the supreme authority for 12 lodges and acted until 1786. The brethren worked actively — on the one hand in the political field, in the court of the Emperor in Vienna, on behalf of Hungary, on the other hand in the country itself, to keep alive and develop the Hungarian language and spirit. Masons issued the first periodicals. They originated the idea of an Academy of Science. They were the first supporters of Hungarian theatrical art; and, in general, there was no important political or cultural movement in which — among founders or followers — masons couldn't be found.

Some lodges in the provinces criticized the orders of Emperor Joseph II (1780-1790), who was not crowned as Hungarian king. As a result he restricted masonic activity to the county capitals, and in this way crippled the masonic work completely. Later Emperor Francis dissolved the lodges in 1795.

Half a century had to pass for literary and political liberalism to become stronger again, and to render the revival of Hungarian Masonry possible.

August Thoma, a bookseller of Silesian origin, settled in Pest, and searched out masons, who were living quietly with no sign of masonic activity. He intended to create a masonic lodge under the protection of a German Grand Lodge, but this plan couldn't be realised so long as Metternich, the iron-handed Austrian chancellor, was in power. When he failed in 1848, the brethren, under the influence of freedom movements all over Europe, established a lodge called: "Louis

Kossuth, the dawn of the Glorious Light." Governor Kossuth paid sympathetic attention to the masonic work, but never became a member of a Hungarian Lodge. The Austrian and Russian invasion soon stopped the masonic meetings, and the disastrous end of the War of independence once again destroyed the activity of the brethern for decades to come.

Following the defeat of the freedom movement in 1849, the most prominent citizens were forced to emigrate. Many of them became acquainted with masonic ideas and endeavours abroad. Lodges favoured the exiled Hungarians all around the world, and the refugees saw the accomplishment and resurrection of their hopes in the Craft, which has always stood for liberty, equality and fraternity. Several of them were initiated in Italy, Switzerland, France and England. The banished Governor Kossuth was made a mason "on sight" in Cincinnati, Ohio in 1852.

In Geneva, Switzerland there was also a lodge called Ister (the Latin name of the Danube) formed by Hungarian brethern and working under Swiss jurisdiction for over 10 years.

As the terror which followed the 1848-49 war subsided, a number of these distinguished personalities returned to Hungary and became the most devout disseminators of the Light.

Throughout the twilight of the constitutional era, while the Hungarian nation and Emperor Francis Joseph tried to effect a compromise, Masonry roused itself again and asked for recognition. Twelve brethren started to reorganize Hungarian Masonry and laid the foundation of the lodge "St. Stephen" in 1861.



Further discussion stopped, because the authorities still prohibited masonic meetings. This situation continued until after the treaty between Austria and Hungary in 1867, when Hungary became a constitutional kingdom, in personal union with Austria. Meanwhile the flowering of Masonry started all over the world. Enemies of the Fraternity tried to prevent the revival, but Masonry had by this time a strong protector in the person of Prime Minister Count Andrassy, who was initiated in Paris, France during his exile. The first lodge in the new era started in October 1867, under the name: "Einigkeit and Vaterlande" (Unity of the Fatherland). This new lodge was sanctioned and protected by the Grand Lodge of England, through the Grand Master the Earl of Zetland, in 1869.

After this first one, six more lodges were founded within a year, and the seven lodges founded the first Blue Grand Lodge in 1870, copying the constitution of the Grand Lodge "Zur Sonne" in Bayreuth, Germany. The Grand Lodge of Frankfurt was the first to recognize the new Grand Lodge, followed by many others, and soon the Hungarian Grand Lodge took a dignified place in the world organization.

About the same time the Scottish Rite came into being in Hungary as well, on the initiative of those who had entered the Rite abroad. They received masonic protection from the Grand Orient de France. Scottish Rite Masonry blossomed too, and after two years, the Grand Orient of Hungary was established, as a second supreme authority over the Hungarian Craft Masons.

Both branches could expand freely, but

progress was very slow. Because of cultural backwardness, political oppression, and national isolation, the public knew very little about Masonry. The aristocracy and army were reserved. The standpoint of the Church (Hungary is mostly Catholic) was antimasonic, being influenced by the controversy between Masonry and Church in the Latin states.

It took fifteen more years until Craft Masonry and Scottish Rite were strong enough to be united and to form the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary in 1886. Historian Franz Pulszky was the first Grand Master. At the outset the new Grand Lodge had supreme jurisdiction over 26 blue and 13 Scottish Rite Lodges, containing 1831 members.

In the next two decades Hungarian Masonry reached its peak. Lodges spread all around the country. In the lodges the members worked on social problems. Their agenda included the provision of working opportunities for all, improved working conditions, diffusion of knowledge, care of moral standards. In this way developed the principal idea of the Craft: Masonry should not be the defender of the strong, but the protector of the weak, in the spirit of fairness and justice.

Soon they built their Temple in Budapest (by then a united city), where it still stands. The consecration ceremonies took place in 1896, when Hungary celebrated her Millennium, the thousandth anniversary of her existence as a state. This was one of the most magnificent festivals of Hungarian Masonry, with the participation of the representatives of the Grand Lodges of New York, Boston, North Carolina, New Hampshire,

Bayreuth, Berlin, Saxony, Portugal, Egypt, Java and the Grand Orient of Belgium.

From year to year new lodges were formed, and they in turn created numerous non-masonic institutions. The Society for Public Education, Society for Crippled Children, Asylum for Homeless People, Children's Aid, Patronage Camps for Children, Distributing Centres for free Bread and Milk for the needy, and several other societies were brought to life by masons before the end of the 19th century.

In 1877 they started a morning paper, edited by masons, to spread masonic spirit and ideas in the secular world. A masonic periodical, the KELET (East), had been published since 1875.

In 1899 Grand Master Neuschloss proclaimed: "Either everyone of us must work to solve the great problems of human society, or we cease to exist"- The lodge from Nagyvarad (a small city in Hungary) was the first to publish its social programme, in 1900, the very first in this subject ever announced in Hungary. Laws for the equality of minorities and races, reformation of existing juries, ecclesiastical-political reform, the separation of State and Church, the right of universal secret suffrage, undenominational free education for everyone, a campaign against duelling, emancipation for women agrarian reforms, etc. were the main subjects in the lodges.

During World War I, there were 32 lodges in Budapest, 51 in the country, and 11 masonic circles. In addition, under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge 20 more lodges existed in



the border area and neighbouring states, augmenting the membership to over 7000, at a time when the whole population of Hungary was over 16 million.

As the number of lodges continued to grow, the Grand Lodge entered into fraternal connection with supreme authorities abroad, and received recognition almost everywhere. There were active and friendly relations not only with the European grand lodges, but with overseas as well, among them the Grand Lodge of Canada in the Province of Ontario.

After the treaty in Trianon (France) in 1919, when new states were formed around Hungary, the Grand Lodge lost its lodges with the detached territories. The "Gross Loge von Wien" in Austria was established from the previous Hungarian lodges already in 1918, gaining protection and permission from the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary.

The Hungarian Grand Lodge held its last grand communication in January 1919. The individual lodges continued their meetings until March, but during the first communist government in 1919, and the counter-revolution and the Roumanian occupation, all masonic life was suppressed. The Temple was seized by a military group; the Minister of Interior Affairs dissolved all the masonic lodges, circles and clubs "for ever", in March 1920.

The formal meetings stopped, but the brethren assembled in the open, to keep awake the brotherly love and to make it possible to keep alive the institutions established by masons. The property was confiscated and the greatest part of the valuable contents of the Temple disappeared; they gradually came to



light later, in bazaars and second hand markets. Only a part of the library and records were deposited in the National Museum and in the Archives.

For a period of 25 years after 1920, a new epoch came into being, when no legal masonic meetings were held in Hungary; but the brethren kept alive the spirit of fellowship, continuing their benevolent and humanitarian work; and beginning in the middle twenties, they attracted into the Craft more than 100 new, valuable younger men, who were initiated abroad.

After the communist dictatorship of Bela Kun in 1919, Hungary became a kingdom without a king, with Admiral Horthy as regent. The authoritarian and reactionary regimes did not like liberal ideas. Although in the first years there were several attacks in the parliament and in the press against Masonry, later the government overlooked their social activities.

In 1927, when Hungary sent an official delegation to the United States for the unveiling ceremonies of the statue of Kossuth, in Cleveland, Ohio, the leaders of the Masons were invited to send their representatives, as part of the official party. The masonic delegates, led by acting Grand Master Joseph Balassa (who had been Deputy G.M. in 1920), an internationally recognized mason, spent weeks in the United States, contacting masonic authorities.

In the mid twenties, when the political situation eased, masons visited the lodges in neighbouring countries, particularly the previous Hungarian Lodges in Czechoslovakia

and in Vienna, putting on formal meetings for the younger generation. They initiated, passed and raised over 100 candidates, first in Czechoslovakian lodges in 1926-28, then in Vienna from 1928. In 1934, those who were initiated (or affiliated) in Vienna, formed a separate lodge under the protection of the Grand Lodge of Vienna, under the name "In labore virtus." The master of the lodge became Alexander Goldmark, who lived in Vienna and worked devotedly from the start to preserve the Light for the Hungarian brethren. Count Carl Lonyai, a Hungarian nobleman, also Deputy Grand Master in Vienna, helped him a great deal. The leaders of these trips from Hungary were G.M. Balassa and Andor Gero, who acted as Grand Secretary and also as the Master of the newly initiated group in Budapest; there the neophytes kept together, and in association with some older members, produced artistic, cultural and scientific lectures.

Such informal meetings continued until the beginning of World War II, when first the war, then the increasing persecution, and finally the siege of Budapest, ended every possibility of contact and communication. The Nazis and their fellow traveller Hungarians dragged away and killed many worthy honorable brethren, and those who succeeded in staying alive looked forward to the arrival of a peaceful future.

When the Grand Lodge was revived in 1945, after 25 years of silence between the two World Wars, the Hungarian people were tired and disenchanted after the long war and Hitler's holocaust. It hoped for a pure democracy, the more so because human rights were now written into the Constitution. The

intelligentsia learned with sympathy and interest about the ideals and aims of the fraternity, and soon, many leading politicians, writers, and artists, among others, were petitioning for initiation.

Joseph Balassa had passed to the Grand Lodge above early 1945 and Dr. Geza Supka was the first regularly elected grand Master. He was Chairman of the Democratic Party, President of the National Museum, and Chief Editor of the daily newspaper "VILAG" (World) which had resumed publication soon after Armistice. His respectability and personality had a great effect in drawing the elite of Hungarian society to Masonry.

There were only 300 Masons in 1945, all of whom had been initiated either before the end of World War I, or elsewhere abroad between the two World Wars. By 1948, with the Grand Lodge performing the degree work, initiating, passing and raising sometimes 10-20 candidates at the same time, the membership increased to 1300. By 1950 this number had grown only to 1500, because after the communist takeover in 1948, an increase in emigration counterbalanced the number of initiations.

After 1948, the oppression of the middle class increased more and more. In January 1949, due to his vulnerable political position G.M. Supka felt it necessary to resign from the Grand Master's chair. Though in his letter of resignation he referred to his ill health, the real reason was generally known by the brethren. The next Grand Communication elected Dr. Marcel Benedek to the high post. He was a professor at the University of Budapest, an esteemed literary scholar, who



had returned to the capital from Transylvania only in 1947, and soon after, had become W.M. of the Deak Ferenc Lodge.

In 1949, it became obvious that the words repeated in the ritual, "the lodge is properly tyled", in reality were no longer true. After 1948 several candidates were initiated, who thereafter regularly reported proceedings in the lodges to the Party or the Secret Police. As well, there were several older members, who were threatened by the Secret Police with the loss of their jobs or even their freedom, should they not report about lodge life. The results seem to show that these informers must have told what they knew truthfully, because no one was persecuted for his masonic activities, either while the lodges were operating or afterwards. Several brethren however were prosecuted for fictitious political crimes, and during investigations they were interrogated also about masonic life in the lodges.

In early 1950, it was obvious that Masonry would not be able to continue working for long. The leaders of the Grand Lodge were under pressure to make political statements in the name of the Hungarian masonry, and it took great diplomatic skill on G.M. Benedek's part to avoid making these declarations, by invoking the apolitical nature of the fraternity. When in early June, in a radio broadcast, Joseph Revai, a cabinet minister, and chief ideologist of the communist party, attacked the lodges and their members because of their liberal attitudes, everybody realized that the days of legal Hungarian Masonry were numbered. Around 6 p.m. on the 12th of June 1950, the Secret Police surrounded the Grand Lodge building. One unit entered, and while



the commander informed the Grand Secretary, Andor Gero, of the Decree of Dissolution pronounced by the Minister of Internal Affairs, his men took over the administrative offices and confiscated all the files and accounts. They also took the bank books from the Grand Treasurer, who happened to be there. They cleared the brethren out of the common rooms. Late arrivals for meetings were turned away at the door. They ordered the Grand Secretary to summon Grand Master Benedek from his home.

The interrogations of the Grand Master and the Grand Secretary were carried out in a courteous manner. Their archives and their masonic objects in the building were seized. Then the grand Master was released, but the Grand Secretary was taken to his private office where the Secret Police confiscated some items, and sealed a bookcase filled with masonic books and writings. It was shipped away the following day. Then they set him free too. The only Mason permitted to stay in the building was the Grand Lodge's permanent Tyler, who lived there and owned the restaurant.

At about the same time the lodges in smaller cities were occupied as well. The chief difference was that there were no masons in the buildings, and the police notified the W.M.s of the lodges about the order of dissolution.

On June 13th, every newspaper carried a short report, "The Minister of Internal Affairs has dissolved the Masonic lodges, which had recently become meeting places for the enemies of the Peoples' Republic, capitalist and other supporters of Western

imperialism". (It is interesting to note, that 30 years earlier when the Right Wing government had dissolved the lodges, their pretext was that the lodges and its members were playing a great role in preparing the country for Bolshevism.)

News about the occupation of the lodge buildings spread fast, and the brethren were shocked. A great many of them were afraid of persecution, and severed all their masonic ties. The more courageous ones kept together, visiting each other in their homes, frequently with their wives, so that the call would look like a family visit. The Grand Master, his deputies, and the Grand Secretary, held meetings regularly to plan for the future of the Craft and to maintain the charity work, which now had become more essential.

It was no longer possible to employ the methods practised between the two world wars, to take promising candidates to other countries for initiation. Hungary was surrounded by communist countries, and the border to Austria was sealed with the Iron Curtain. The Secret Police watched carefully to ensure that no public meetings should take place, and its informers sometimes infiltrated even the smallest private gatherings. In spite of these difficulties, the friendship among the brethren continued.

The permanent Tyler, through wining and dining, became friendly with the guards of the Grand Lodge building, and they closed an eye, so that he was able to smuggle aprons, jewels, valuable gavels, books of the ritual, and other masonic objects out of the building. These he distributed among reliable and loyal Masons. (Editors note: A number of these

valuable treasures were displayed at the time of Bro. Gero's presentation).

Before the dispersal of the Grand Lodge, a group of young, more radical Masons, had wanted to form a new lodge, to be named "Kossuth" after the leader of the War of Independence in 1848. This lodge had not yet become a reality before the closing of Grand Lodge, but even so the members of the group met every week after June 1950, in private homes, bringing their wives to cover up. They held regular meetings, without any ritual work, in which they discussed current events and masonic subjects. The Grand Master and Grand Secretary participated frequently in these meetings. During the spring of 1951, this group became so daring that, with the dispensation of the Grand Master, in his summer cottage, it passed and raised 3 of their members who had not reached the Third degree before the lodges had been dissolved. By this means it hoped to have enough Master Masons to form a lodge when the opportunity arose. When these degrees were being conferred, the W.M.'s chair was occupied by the Grand Master, and in the ritual he was assisted by the Grand Secretary and the Grand Preparing Master (a position similar to the Grand Deacon in the Canadian Grand Lodges), the latter being himself a member of the Kossuth group. This precedent was followed by a few more lodges, in secret meetings behind the closed doors of private houses, with the help of ardent brethren.

That year brought new ordeals to many masons. The communist government, led by party secretary Matthias Rakosi, under cover of the night, dragged many masons and their families away from their homes in Budapest,



and within hours relocated them, with very few of their possessions, on small villages or farms, where they had to live under inhuman circumstances. Most of the farmers and villagers did not dare to give much help or assistance to these "enemies of the Peoples' Republic." After several months of struggling and suffering, some of the older ones succeeded in finding homes in asylums established in smaller towns. Those who were not displaced from the capital tried to organize some help for the needy, and visited their friends - a dangerous undertaking; but many brethren were afraid to maintain any connections with their fellow Masons.

Only after the death of Stalin in 1953 did the political situation ease to any extent, so that some of the displaced persons were able to move back to the outskirts of Budapest.

A more liberal atmosphere developed during the period of destalinization in the Soviet Union, and this gave more hope for Hungary as well.

The Fall of 1956 brought considerable changes for Hungarian Masonry. On October 23rd, university students started a peaceful march through the streets of Budapest, striving for more freedom. Workers joined in, and it soon turned into a loud anti-Russian demonstration. The same night, when the Secret Police attempted to suppress the demonstrators, part of the Hungarian army came to the help of the students and workers, and an open battle broke out. The next day, Soviet troops stationed in the country began to join in the fighting, but many of them deserted their units to help the Hungarian



cause. During the first days in November, many people expected Hungary to become a neutral and independent country like Austria. Grand Master Benedek and Grand Secretary Gero petitioned the Union of Engineers and Technicians, who were now in possession of the Grand Lodge building, to return it to the Grand Lodge. On November 3rd an agreement was reached by which the building would be shared for a time until the Union could find new headquarters. But the next day the Soviet invasion crushed all hopes.

During the weeks and months which followed, 200,000 refugees left the country. Among them were a large number of young and middle aged brethren. They were followed within a few years by older ones. The mass emigration not only decreased the number of active Masons considerably, but also crippled the charity work to a great extent. The "Masonic Aid for Hungary", based in New York and under the chairmanship of R.W.Bro. Arthur Keil, had been contributing the largest share to the relief programme right from the dissolution of the lodges. Immediately after 1956, it became almost the sole source for funds, with its contributions being supplemented only by small irregular collections.

In March 1959, Andor Gero emigrated to Canada, where he soon started to organize Hungarian masons living in the Western Hemisphere. He established contacts with most of them, and helped them to find each other. By 1962, he published the roster of Hungarian Masons abroad, which contained 400 names and addresses.

In Budapest, his duties were taken over by Bela Sulyok, a member of Reform Lodge, who under the guidance of the Grand Master, kept contact with the masons, visited their meetings, corresponded with brethren in other countries, and distributed the available funds amongst the needy.

For some time G.M. Benedek had been deeply concerned about the future of the fraternity. He was anxious to find some means of arranging for succession in the leadership. He wrote a letter to Dr. George Takacs, who had by then become the head of Reform Lodge.

"Circumstances," he wrote "have not permitted an outstanding personality to emerge publicly, nor do they allow the democratic electoral process to run its course. I find myself in the position of having to name my successor from those friends whose character and ability I have learned to know. To my successor I cannot give titles or power, nor even an opportunity to be recognized in public. I can only bestow on him duties, responsibilities, and anxieties.

As long as I am alive, we shall work together as we have in the past. The time is foreseeable when our old, regularly-initiated members will depart. But the idea which we represent, social and spiritual advancement, a higher sense of morality and humanism, cannot perish with us. Even in the most perfect society there is a distinct need for a group of men to uphold the principles of humanism and morality. Humanism will have to alleviate the inevitable cruelties of the class struggle in our society; and, in a classless society, the struggle for a more humane, individualistic existence will have to be

supported by the examples of a higher morality.

We may have to give up the great conjunctive bonds of form and symbols, and in an informal manner we must create a circle of men who are worthy or capable of development. We shall never cease to try to educate worthy men to work on the rough ashlar. We may have to give up the rituals, but we cannot compromise on the essential elements, which are progress, morality, humanism."

He made certain that copies of this letter would reach the brethren abroad, particularly the Hungarian lodges and circles. From then on Dr. Takacs, as Grand Master's delegate, worked closely together with the Grand Master.

During the previous two centuries, due to the political and economic situation, several thousand Hungarians had emigrated to the West, among them many masons, who brought along the masonic spirit and tried to form new lodges in the countries to which they immigrated. They were usually joined by several fellow Hungarians, who learned about the Craft after leaving home. At the turn of this Century, many emigrants looked for the promised land in America. Those who got initiated into American lodges, felt that, by forming Hungarian lodges, they could maintain the Hungarian spirit better. Several lodges were brought to life under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Ohio in and around Cleveland, which had and has a great Hungarian population. In 1918 Ehlers Lodge was constituted in New York City by Hungarians and it had worked till 1974. There was a masonic lodge formed in Connecticut in the early



1920's, named after the great Hungarian patriot, Kossuth.

There was a new emigration wave after the Second World War also, and together with the brethren who left Hungary after 1956, they were able to form new Hungarian lodges in Argentina, Brazil and France. In Vienna, the Grand Lodge gave a helping hand to all the refugees.

Andor Gero brought into being the Unitas Circle in Toronto in June 1959, and it was soon followed by the Unitas Circle in Montreal.

In June 1962, Andor Gero celebrated his 80th birthday and his 50th anniversary as a mason. Delegations from Ehlers Lodge, New York, and Unitas Circle, Montreal, came to Toronto, and they were joined by individual brethren from other parts of Canada and the USA., but by means of letters and telegrams the whole of Hungarian Masonry participated in the testimonial meeting, which was held according to the Hungarian rituals. Two months later the Grand Secretary passed to the Grand Lodge above. At its first September meeting, the Circle in Toronto changed its name to "Andor Gero Hungarian Circle in Toronto" and elected to the chair Bro.Desider Patzauer, a distinguished mason, who came from Arpad Lodge in Szeged. He held the gavel for seven years.

In the Spring of 1963, W.Bro. Jean Szego, the Master of Martinovics Lodge in Paris, France, and W.Bro. Pablo Vamos, the Master of Kossuth Lodge in Buenos Aires, happened to be in Budapest at the same time. They held meetings with the leaders of the Hungarian



masons. Upon their return, Martinovics Lodge, with the consent of the Grand Lodge of France, sent official letters to the two Canadian circles, conveying a message from G.M. Benedek. He asked them to resume regular lodge work, so they might initiate, pass and raise brethren in the name of the Symbolic Grand Lodge in Hungary "due to extraordinary times and circumstances". He added the promise that "when the present situation changes, the newly established Grand Lodge will recognize itself as supreme authority of these lodges". This dispensation was ratified in letters which G.M. Benedek wrote to the W.M's of the Canadian-Hungarian lodges on December 30th, 1964.

In 1964, R.W.Bro. Arthur H. Keil obtained dispensations from the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York and six members from each of Toronto and Montreal became affiliated with Ehlers Lodge No. 953 in New York City.

Martinovics Lodge celebrated its tenth anniversary in October 1966. On that occasion, W.M. Michel Kemeny organized an international Hungarian convention in Paris, at which more than 100 Hungarian brethren took part, mainly from Europe, but with a good representation from the North and South American lodges as well. There were also several brethren from Hungary, who attended regular meetings for the first time in 16 years. They were led by Dr. Takacs, who represented the Grand Master, and was received with all honours at a meeting held by the Grand Loge de France and conducted in French. Next day some visiting brethren from Hungary were passed and raised, with the work being conducted in Hungarian. The Grand Master's

delegate called a meeting with the leaders of the Hungarian lodges abroad, where they set up a programme so that the same topics would be discussed independently in each lodge, and reports on the discussions exchanged; they established a co-ordination centre in Toronto to keep in touch with the brethren in the Western Hemisphere. The participants also pledged regular contributions to help the widows and needy in Hungary. They have maintained that pledge ever since.

Encouraged by the success of the Paris meetings, the two Canadian lodges invited the delegates to Canada in September 1967, on the occasion of Canada's Centennial Celebrations. Hungarian meetings were held in both Montreal and Toronto, with the participation of the Hungarian-Canadian brethren and of visitors, mainly from the U.S.A. and the South American lodges. In March 1969, the two South American lodges welcomed the Hungarian delegates from Europe and North America, and festive masonic meetings took place in both Sao Paulo and Buenos Aires, under the jurisdictions of the Grand Lodges of the State of Sao Paulo and the Argentine Republic. Both Grand Masters attended the meetings, in Portuguese-Hungarian and Spanish-Hungarian, and the Hungarian Grand Master's delegate was also received with all honours.

Later that Spring, Bela Sulyok asked to be relieved of his duties as acting Grand Secretary. The Grand Master delegated a committee of three, members of different lodges, to administer the distribution of the charity funds.

On May 30, 1964, Grand Master Benedek was called to the M.H.; with him the last duly

elected leader of the Grand Lodge of Hungary passed to the Grand Lodge above. Soon it became apparent that his kindly and revered personality had been the cement which had kept Hungarian Masonry together for two decades. Dr. Takacs failed to hit the right tune with the brethren of different lodges, and he became disillusioned himself. On March 23, 1973, he notified the Hungarian lodges in foreign countries that, due to his age and physical condition, he was giving up all masonic activities.

There was another international meeting held in Paris in 1971; there Dr. Takacs alone represented the Hungarian masons. It was well attended by brethren from Europe and both North and South America. The last of these meetings was held again in Paris, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of Martinovics Lodge, but on that occasion neither the Canadian masons, nor anybody from Hungary was present.

In the years before the First World War, as we have seen, the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary had held an honoured place in world Freemasonry, and had been in amity with many other bodies, including the Grand Lodge of Canada. When Hungarian Masonry was suppressed in the years after 1919, those fraternal relations of course had been allowed to lapse. Many jurisdictions move slowly in the matter of extending recognition. Even though the Grand Lodge of Hungary had renewed its activities for five years, from 1945 to 1950, still by the time the doors were closed in 1950 it had not yet entered into formal relations with the Grand Lodge of Canada in the Province of Ontario, or with the Grand Lodge of Quebec. As a result, through no



fault of their own, the brethren who immigrated to Canada could not be recognized as "regular" Masons, and could not sit in lodge with their Canadian brethren unless they happened also to belong to some "recognized" body.

The brethren both in Montreal and in Toronto had tried for a number of years to become affiliated with Canadian masonry. In 1971, the ruling Master of Unitas Lodge in Montreal, W.Bro. Zoltan Roman, and his Secretary, Bro. Stephen Kery, started negotiations with M.W.Bro. Egerton Brown, the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Quebec, and soon came to an understanding, that the Royal Victoria Lodge No. 57 would absorb the Hungarian brethren. By the end of 1972, 31 former Unitas members became members of this old Canadian lodge.

Towards the end of 1973, the leaders of Andor Gero Lodge in Toronto came to an agreement with the Grand Lodge of Canada in the Province of Ontario. Receiving a dispensation from G.M. Turner, under the leadership of M.W.Bro. William K. Bailey (who had known this group for several years) and M.W.Bro. Harry L. Martyn, Past Grand Masters, they formed a new lodge under the same name. Four more Grand Lodge officers, V.W. Brethren Eugene E. Baker, William Edwards, George Jamieson, Lloyd Mellor, and some of the Hungarian Brethren who had been members of Ehlers Lodge, in New York, or Canadian Lodges, became charter members.

On September 14th, 1974, Andor Gero Lodge No. 726 was consecrated. The event was a festive occasion not only for us, who after wandering in the wilderness for many years,



finally achieved our masonic legality within the body of our Grand Lodge, but also for grand Lodge, which formed the first ethnic lodge in its history of more than a century. The ceremony was conducted by then Deputy Grand Master Eric William Nancekivell and R.W.Bro. Arthur J. Dawson, D.D.G.M. of Toronto District 5, with most of the acting Grand Lodge officers present, led by Past Masters William K Bailey and Harry L. Martyn.

Our W.Bro. Dr. Ernest Simo was essential in forging this event. In September 1973, he directed a letter to Grand Secretary M.W.Bro. J.A. Irvine, outlining our position. This led to meetings with the two Past Grand Masters. The understanding was, that the official language and ritual would be that of the Grand Lodge, but those members of the Hungarian group who were not yet recognized would go through on abbreviated ceremonies of initiation, passing and raising, and become full Master Masons of the lodge. We could keep our identity, and beyond the ritual, could work in the spirit we had been working in the past. We could continue our educational and humanitarian programme.

Dr. Simo went through the three degrees in one evening on our first meeting in January 1974, after the lodge was constituted U.D., and with him our two oldest members, who had not mastered the English language. M.W.Bros. Bailey and Martyn organized the Toronto District lodges to provide degree teams to confer the three degrees on the former members of the Hungarian group. With special dispensation from the G.M., in February 1974, on four consecutive Saturdays, the two Past G.M.'s provided changing teams from different lodges, to initiate five candidates each

Saturday morning, pass them at noon, and raise them in the afternoon. By the end of February, all members were legally accepted Master Masons of this Grand Jurisdiction. These events, which were unprecedented in Canada, were the talk of the town, and we gained many new friends, who, after 12 years, still remember those unique Saturdays and come back to visit our lodge occasionally.

During the following years, several of our members frequently visited the lodges both in our district and in other Toronto districts. At the same time we received many visitors who were interested in our way of practicing Masonry. Several of our members who became known in the lodges were invited to present papers. We also had many guest speakers trying to teach us, or explain to us, the Canadian and North American ways of practicing Masonry. In 1976, on a Toronto District 5 Education Night, we demonstrated the Hungarian initiation (in English); this was repeated in 1985 with R.W.Bro. Wallace E. McLeod, our honorary member, in King Solomon's chair, and will be performed again in May 1986 on a Toronto District 3 Education Night.

When Heritage Lodge was formed, we considered ourselves too young in Canadian masonry to become charter members, but W.Bro. Simo and myself were among the first 10 on the regular members' roster. Since then, several of our Past Masters have affiliated.

Unfortunately some of our members became disenchanted with the repetitious degree work, and not finding enough educational and humanitarian work in other lodges, stopped attending altogether. Several found it a burden to practice even the opening and

closing ceremonies, and throughout the years seven of our members have left our ranks asking for a demit. Naturally, we have also lost some members who regrettably have passed to the Grand Lodge Above.

Luckily, partially due to new initiations, partially through affiliations from other lodges, and because of several brethren, who had been members of Royal Victoria Lodge in Montreal but moved to Toronto, our Lodge has increased, and now we can count 45 members. This growth in ten years is not substantial, but throughout the years we have tried to maintain our identity, and that necessarily put a limit on opening our doors to prospective candidates.

It is regrettable, but inevitable, that our original members who brought and established the educational and humanitarian nature of Hungarian masonry are growing old and sooner or later will disappear from the scene. The younger ones will blend in more and more into Canadian masonry, and we hope they will be able to keep the lodge working for many years.

Inside Hungary, the outlook is grim. This year is the 100th anniversary of the formation of the Symbolic Grand Lodge in Hungary. The Temple is dark, silence prevails under the columns. There will not be any celebrations. Time has taken its toll. Not one past Grand Lodge officer remains alive in the country. The Relief Committee still exists with new members, none of them under 70. At the last count, there were still 55 on the receiving end. There are a handful of Masons in Hungary who were initiated during the last two decades secretly in Vienna, Germany

or France, but far too few.

This long dormant period is by no means new in the history of Hungarian masonry. In the 19th century, after almost 100 years of silence the lodges came to life.

We can only hope, if and when the political situation changes, there will be someone somewhere who will rekindle the flame, and the Lights of Wisdom, Strength and Beauty will shine again in the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary.



## RESPONSE TO THE PAPER

### "The History of Hungarian Freemasonry"

by

R.W.Bro. Balfour LeGresley

I must congratulate you Brother Gero on contributing to the Hertitage Lodge collection, a paper of great importance. It is fitting that we should record the history of masonry in other countries so that brethren with ancestry in those countries will have a true and detailed knowledge of their masonic roots. It is especially important that the sequence of events that led to the institution of Andor Gero lodge be recognized and recorded.

It is proper that I tell you that I was asked some time ago, to give this report on behalf of W.Bro. John Hunter who had not expected to be here. I have read the paper and offer my own comments together with some that were given by W.Bro. Hunter. When it was discovered that he could be here tonight I offered to return this privilege to him but he coerced me into continuing.

I must first commend Brother Gero on the considerable length of the paper and the detail it contains. Let me say that I am always impressed by the manner in which Emery Gero and the members of Andor Gero Lodge have learned to express themselves so effectively and so fluently in their new language of English. It makes me feel very humble and inadequate by comparison as I am not sure that I could learn to perform as well in Hungarian.

Bro. Gero, you have covered almost 250 years of Hungarian Freemasonry since the first

symbolic lodge in Brasso which you mentioned. It seems obvious that you had to limit the detail you could present on much of the early period however I do hope that when your paper is printed, you will include references to your sources so that future researchers will know where to begin their search for more information.

W.Bro. John Hunter in 1976 presented a shorter but detailed paper before Andor Gero Lodge entitled "Freemasons in 18th Century Hungary". He provides important political background for the times when Freemasonry first appeared in Hungary and was later banned, and he introduced two brethren who were important after 1790: Brother Kazinczy, whose diary described the masonry of that period and Brother Martinovits who gave his life for the cause of freedom.

Brother Marinovits was an ex-Franciscan Monk, a University Professor, a writer and Journalist, who brought Jacobite ideas from Paris. He organized a group that was seen as being subversive because it promoted freedom of the individual and national independence at a time of political oppression. Martinovic and six others, five of them masons, were arrested and executed for treason. We have heard mention tonight of Martinovits Lodge in Paris and I wonder if this lodge was named in honour of this freedom fighter who was martyred. Perhaps Brother Gero can enlighten us further on this point.

Brother Kazinczy was found in possession of the cathecism which the Martinovits group used to express their beliefs and for this was condemned to death. His sentence was commuted to life imprisonment and he spent

six-and-a-half years in a dungeon in Austria. The experiences of Brothers Martinovits and Kazinczy show us that masons in those times fought with a purpose for ideals which today we propound in our ceremonies but which we are not challenged to defend, and which we perhaps take for granted.

Brother Gero several times mentioned Louis Kossuth, and the tribute paid to him by masons both in Hungary and in the United States through their having named Lodges in his honour. It appears to me that Louis Kossuth is being honoured more as a symbol of the freedom and democracy inherent in masonry than for his importance as a mason.

My own research has shown that Louis Kossuth was a left-wing patriot and politician. He was an orator who could arouse fire in the breasts of his audience. He was the force behind the revolution for freedom in 1848 in Hungary, and for a brief time was appointed Governor until he was forced to flee to spend the rest of his life in exile.

As Brother Gero has indicated, he was made a mason rather casually in Cincinnati in 1852 while 'passing through' on a speaking tour to gather support for his fight for political freedom in Hungary. We are taught that politics and masonry are not to be mixed yet it seems that he was taking advantage of it, if not as an actual weapon, certainly as a source of strong support for his cause.

It should be of interest to us that although Kossuth's period of masonic activity was very brief, perhaps only a year or two, he is still hailed by hungarian masons as a hero.

I think this shows the manner in which the principles of masonry stand out as a beacon lighting the path to freedom and democracy and provide a practical basis for the fight for political freedom.

I note Brother Gero that the bulk of your paper details the more recent decades following the revival of the Grand Lodge of Hungary in 1945 and the events that ultimately led to the formation of the Andor Gero Lodge. The detail in this part of your paper is outstanding and it will be wonderful to have in our records a description of these events written by one who was there.

Worshipful Master, I think we must all agree that the paper this evening has provided us with a rich experience. We have had a lesson in history, a lesson in philosophy and in politics, and we have seen that when brethren of spirit are firm in their resolve, no barrier is too difficult for them to overcome. Brother Gero, It has been a privilege to be able to make comments on your excellent paper. May I express to you the appreciation of the Lodge and wish you every success in your masonic work.



## INTRODUCTION OF W.BRO. GLENSON T. JONES

by

R.W. Bro. K.L. Whiting

There is an old cliché that says - You win some and you lose some.

Well today I have won one, for it is my good fortune to have the opportunity to introduce to the brethren assembled, my good friend Glen Jones, the Archivist of Heritage Lodge and our Guest Speaker today.

Glen brings an impressive list of Masonic credentials with him to support his talk, "The Byways of Masonry", which is an insight into the development of some of the appendant Masonic bodies to which many of the brethren present belong and which are interesting sidelines to the conventional Masonic path which we all traverse.

Glen was born in Swansea, South Wales, Great Britain in 1938. His parents emigrated to Alberta in 1940 and when Glen grew up he graduated from the University of Alberta with a BSc in Electronic Engineering in 1961. He worked in England, Hamilton and Waterloo Ontario before settling in Ottawa in 1969 and is now employed by Bell-Northern Research in charge of corporate micro-computer network.

He is a member of the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario, Past President of the Ottawa-Georgetown twinning committee and is a Past President of the Kanata Ontario Jaycees.

Glen was initiated in Bytown Lodge #721 in 1976 and affiliated with Chaudiere Lodge #264, serving as that Lodge's Worshipful Master in 1983.

Research into Masonic History and symbolism became his hobby, in fact if it wasn't necessary to work for a living, I am sure it would have become his avocation. In 1980, in honour of the 125th Anniversary of our Grand Lodge, he produced a catalogue of the Masonic collection of the late A.J.B. Milborne, the noted Canadian Masonic Scholar from Montreal, which is housed in the Public Archives of Canada.

He joined Capital City Council #154 of the Allied Masonic Degrees of the USA as a Charter Member in 1979 and was its Sovereign Master in 1981. He played a strong part in helping to found the Canadian Association Allied Masonic Degrees Councils and was president of that body in 1984.

When the Grand Council Allied Masonic Degrees of Canada was formed in the fall of 1984, Glen was elected to the office of Junior Grand Warden, however, due to the untimely death of the Deputy Grand Master R.Ven. Bro. Reg Forest-Jones he was prevailed upon to assume the mantle of Deputy Grand Master of AMD in Canada. At the first Annual Communication of the Grand Council of Allied Masonic Degrees of Canada held in London Ontario on October 19, 1985, R.Ven Bro. Glen T. Jones was elected and installed as M.Ven. Bro. Glen T. Jones, Grand Master, Grand Council of allied Masonic Degrees of Canada.

Glen is also a past Celebrant VII grade

of the Toronto College, Societas Rosicruciana in Anglia, which is the Rosicrucian Society of Freemasons.

He is the Historian of his mother Lodge, Bytown #721 and has been the Archivist of Heritage Lodge for the past three years.

Glen is an officer of Ottawa Chapter #222 Royal Arch Masons; a member of the Correspondence circle of Quatuor Coronati Lodge #2076, of London England; A member of the Maine Lodge of Research and also of the Southern California Lodge of Research. He is a member of Gedeliah Council #16 Royal and Select Masters; Ottawa Perceptory #32 Knights Templar; St. Aidens York Rite College #68; York Tabernacle #93 Holy Royal Arch Knight Templar Priests; Ottawa Lodge of Perfection, Murray Chapter Rose Croix and the Ottawa Consistory 32<sup>O</sup>, of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite. He is a member of the Grand College of Rites of the USA; the Knight Masons of the USA; Canada Council #27, Universal Craftsmen Council of Engineers; The Philalethes Society; The Royal Order of ERI, in England; and the Worshipful Society of Free Masons (Operative), also in England.

As if his own Masonic activities were not enough, some of which require his driving from Ottawa to Toronto several times each year, he is also a member of the advisory board of Ottawa Assembly #3 of the Order of Rainbow for Girls. His Daughter Paula is current Worthy Advisor of that group.

A worthy Scholar, a dedicated Mason an ardent Historian and happily for me, a good friend.

Brethren, it is my pleasure to introduce  
W.Bro. Glenson Trelevyn Jones and his  
presentation "The Byways of Masonry".



# THE BYWAYS OF MASONRY\*

by

W.Bro. Glenison T. Jones

## 1. Introduction

My purpose in writing this paper is to put some perspective on the growth of "addition degrees" within Freemasonry. I have tried to give an overview of when and where these additional degrees and Rites arose and, to some extent, the reasons for their growth. The development of each body has been followed up to the point of the establishment of the first Grand Body from which our present Grand Lodges, Chapters, Councils, Consistories, etc. can be said to have derived.

I had intended to follow the development of each rite through to the establishment of the first permanent Grand Body in Canada, but soon found that there was too much material for a single paper of any reasonable length. I hope to extend this study in these directions in another paper. Also, much as some of the bodies formed in the 1800s. such as the Societas Rosicruciana In Anglia and the Allied Masonic Degrees, are dear to my heart, I will leave these to another paper.

---

\*Paper presented at the Regular Meeting of the Heritage Lodge held in the Brockville Masonic Temple, 3 George St., Brockville, Ontario, Saturday afternoon, May 17, 1986.

## 2. Early Operative Masonry

It is clear that early operative masonry developed more or less directly from the craft guilds in England. Masons were not alone in having such assemblies or associations. In fact there were forty seven known craft guilds in London in the 14th century (Ref.8.3.2-3 pg.7). Masonic guilds, in fact, were probably among the least prevalent at that time.

The guilds which became the strongest and which survived the test of time were those of a religious character, having various social and benevolent functions. The rise of the guild organizations is strongly linked to the social, economic and industrial development of England during the 11th through 18th centuries. One of these, the London Masons' Company, is known to have had a continuous existence back to at least 1418 A.D.

Many of the old operative lodges had Old Charges or manuscript constitutions. The possession of one of these was viewed as full and sufficient authority to maintain an independent existence as a lodge. Some 120 of these have been found and analyzed. They date from C. 1390 through the 18th Century.

The ritual of the time was very simple. It consisted of a prayer or invocation, a reading of historical portions of the Old Charge, typically illustrating the progression of the craft from the Holy Land to England, the story of the Athelstan-Edwin assembly at York, the oath of fidelity, the reading of the "Charges" and the sealing of the oath on the manuscript. It was not until C.1640 that evidence of masonic secrets in an admission ceremony is found.

### 3. The Growth of Non-Operative Masonry

We find non-operative members being admitted to operative lodges as early as 1634. At first only a few "gentry" members joined the simple operative lodges, but by 1646 there was at least one lodge composed entirely of non-operatives.

I imagine that all of you have heard the words; "...it is not in the power of any Man or Body of Men to make innovation in the Body of Masonry". How many of you realize that these words were not derived from the Operative constitutions or Old Charges but first appeared in the Book of Consititutions of the United Grand Lodge of England in 1827?

It is further interesting to note that these words are misquoted because what it actually says is; "... it is not in the power of any Man or Body of Men to make innovation in the Body of Masonry without the Consent first of the Annual Grand Lodge".

T.O. Haunch states (Ref. 8.3.2 -5 pg. 149-167) that Grand Lodge itself was an innovation; that independent Lodges of free and accepted masons had existed back as far as the 17th century. When the four London lodges formed themselves into the first Grand Lodge, they did so not to control the degees or to defend any landmarks, but rather, as they said, 'to cement together under a Grand Master as the Center of Union and Harmony'. It is doubtful if any of the participants thought of anything more than a social purpose in getting the lodges together in an assemblage or 'grand lodge'.

#### 4. The Early Grand Lodge Period

Early speculative Craft Masonry consisted of only two degrees, the EA and Fellow-of-the-Craft or Master's Part (Ref. 8.3.1-12) but, soon after the formation of the first Grand Lodge, the Master's Part evolved into the MM degree and a separate FC degree was developed from part of the EA degree. The whole process of the development of speculative Masonry, has been one of speculating or exploring the mysterious something which non-operative Masons found in the primitive Operative ritual and traditions.

Lionel Vibert states (Ref. 8.3.2-4,pg.31) that the trigradal system, that we know today as Craft Masonry, is a development at the hands of speculative craftsmen from a Gild system which consisted originally of a simple oath of admission for young apprentices, a ceremony for his later full membership and, perhaps, another rite associated with mastership. He places the development of the FC Degree at about 1730, long after the formation of the first Grand Lodge. Robert Lindsay (Ref. 8.3.5-2) places this about 5 years earlier.

The first Grand Lodge was not in a position, or of a mind to dictate to lodges in general, outside, perhaps of those in the London area. We have no record of the actions of Grand Lodge until 1723 when the first minute book was started, except the writings of Anderson in his 1738 issue of the "New Book Of Constitutions".

By 1723, however, Grand Lodge was consolidating its position. It had elected its first Grand Master of noble blood and was



assuming administrative powers relative to the lodges in and around London. The 1723 Constitutions indicate, however, that Grand Lodge was acting purely locally, in that the Book of Constitutions was for use by the lodges in London and Westminster.

Haunch states (Ref. 8.3.2-5 pg. 51-53) that, in England, the first half of the 18th Century after 1714 was one of good government. of peaceful economic development and of a new enlightened social philosophy. In this environment, and after the formation of Grand Lodge in 1717, Freemasonry flourished and became very popular.

Pope (Ref. 8.3.2-4 pg. 471-474) shows that the number of Lodges in London increased from 4 to 116 from 1717 to 1740, and then dropped sharply to about 75 by 1757. The count then rises again to 160 by 1760. He ascribes this to a number of factors, including the unstable condition in England from 1740 to 1750 which culminated in the unsuccessful Jacobite Revolution of 1745, the shift from the former Christian character of Masonry, the Papal bull against Freemasons of 1738, a period of disfavor of English society toward Freemasonry triggered by the exposures of 1723 and 1730, and the four London mock processions by the scald Miserables between 1741 and 1745.

## 5. The Evolution of Speculative Masonry

B.E. Jones (Ref. 8.3.1-5 pg.493) points out that the development of the MM degree with its Hiramic legend sometime prior to 1730 seemed to have left the Brethren somewhat discontent as it appeared to leave something to

come later. This could account for the rapid rise of the Royal Arch which offered what could be seen as the completion of the third Degree. It was probably also a factor encouraging the rise of the Royal Order and the Scot's or ecossais degrees.

Robert Lindsay (Ref. 8.3.5-2) believed that the Grand Lodge of 1717 began diverging from the ways of Accepted Masonry after the publication in 1723 of the Constitutions in that it removed the original Christian basis for membership and substituted a deistic one, i.e. requiring a belief in "the Religion in which all Men agree". He states (pg. 41) that this was one of the motivations for the formation of the Royal Order in London between 1725 and 1741. The Royal Order of Scotland was formed with the assistance of a warrant issued in 1750 by the governing body which was known as The Provincial Grand Lodge in South Britain. The original Royal Order in England seems to have disappeared about the time of the formation of the Grand Lodge of the Ancients (1751), and Lindsay implies (pg. 37) that these events may have been related. It may interest you to know that this book by Lindsay was edited and amended by Bro. A.J.B. Milborne, a Past Provincial Grand Master of the Provincial Grand Lodge of the Royal Order in the Province of Quebec and a full member of the Quator Coronati Lodge of research.

The early "Scot's" or "Ecossais" degrees also developed around 1730 to 1740, and probably for similar reasons. There are two main theories of the origin of these degrees. The first is that they originated in England about 1730 and then spread to France about 1735 where they became very popular. The second theory is that they developed in France

about 1725, partly in reaction to the new theism of English Craft Masonry as indicated in Anderson's Constitutions of 1723. (Refs. 8.3.4-5 pgs. 3-10 & 8.3.1-8 pgs. 9-34).

The first mention of higher degrees in England is that of a Scots Master Lodge which met regularly in 1733 at the Devil's Tavern in London. There are other references to Scotch or Scot's Masonry in England through 1758. Interest in these degrees seems to have declined after 1740. It has been noted that the higher degrees were tainted in many English minds with a Jacobite flavor. The Jacobites were the supporters of the Stuart pretender to the throne of England. They were known to have been active in the promotion, and perhaps the development, of higher degrees especially in France. The Jacobite cause culminated in the abortive 1745 Rebellion.

English Craft Masonry was carried to France soon after the formation of Grand Lodge and the first lodge was founded about 1725. High degree masonry is known to have existed in France since 1737 and there were high degree lodges in Paris about 1742. In addition to whatever motivation that the de-Christianization of Craft Masonry may have produced, there were in France two other influences which could have influenced the growth of the High Degrees. These were, a difference in national temperament, and the fact that, in contrast to England where Masonry appealed primarily to the middle class, Masonry in France was often an upper class activity. The Higher Degree lodges were a means to distance themselves from the middle classes who later swarmed to Craft Masonry. These bodies could set their own rules for membership which often included intellectual



attainment.

There are hints of what is now known as Royal Arch symbolism prior to the formation of the first Grand Lodge. There were many references during the 1720s to Arch Symbols and to movable letters which could refer to early RAM development. In the 1730s, definite references have been found to higher degrees and to Scots Master Lodges. Bernard Jones (Ref. 8.3.3.1-1 pg. 38-43) states that the early "Scots" degrees contained much material which is today found in the Royal Arch and the Mark Degrees. He adds that it cannot be said with certainty that the Royal Arch developed from the Scots Degrees or vice versa but he thinks that the evidence points to the former.

The first printed reference to the Royal Arch was in 1743 and there is reasonable evidence that a RA ritual was worked in Scotland in the early 1740s. RA ceremonies were worked in Ireland before 1759 and in the U.S.A. in 1753.

The rise and growth of the Royal Arch was greatly influenced by the establishment of a rival Grand Lodge, the "Ancients". This second Grand Lodge was formed in 1751 by a group of largely Irish and Scottish masons residing in England. They were joined by many discontented English masons. The premier Grand Lodge was soon nick-named the "Moderns" because they were charged, not entirely fairly, with making innovations in the Ancient Landmarks; including de-Christianizing the ritual, abandoning portions of the ritual, ignoring the esoteric Installation of the Master and refusing to acknowledge the antiquity of the Royal Arch.



We cannot go into the development of this conflict or its resolution some 60 years later except to point out that the Royal Arch received great attention from masons of both camps in the ensuing years, partly because the Ancients came to be called the Grand Lodge of Four Degrees. Many "Modern" masons acquired this degree and a number of "Modern" lodges were known to have practiced the degree under their Craft warrants, without official approval, but also without much objection.

The world's first Grand Chapter came about, not at the hands of the Ancients, as might have been expected, but among the Modern masons. The Ancients didn't need a Grand Chapter since they were encouraged to practice the Royal Arch under their Craft warrants. The Moderns, however, were, at least officially, forbidden from assembling in higher degrees under their Craft warrants.

The first Grand Chapter was formed on July 22, 1766 (Ref. 8.3.2-3 pgs. 280-284 and Ref. 8.3.3.1-1). This was accomplished by signing of the Charter of Compact by 30 "Modern" masons who had "passed the Arch". It is very significant that although the Grand Lodge, as a point of policy, had no use for the Royal Arch, the person who signed as the head of that Grand Chapter was none other than Lord Blayney, who was at that time the Grand Master of the Moderns!!! Other important members were Thomas Dunckerley, John Allen and Thomas French.

This Grand Chapter did not immediately assume governing functions, in fact it acted largely as a Chapter for three years. In 1769, however, it started issuing Charters for subordinate Chapters and by 1781 a total 25

had come into existence. One of these Charters went to Quebec, in 1780. The Ancients formed their Grand Chapter about 1771 to defend their right to the degree.

Referring back to the Royal Order of Scotland, I mentioned that it was formed with the assistance of a warrant issued by the Provincial Grand Lodge in South Britain in 1750. This phrasing needs to be explained. The Warrant was a Patent appointing one William Mitchell as Provincial Grand Master of the Order in the Seven Provinces, now known as the Netherlands. The Warrant indicates that it was signed in the 9th year of the Provincial Grand Mastership of the signator. The name of the P.G.M. is only given as Sir William R.L.F. (R.L.F. stood for the characteristic - Relief).

It is not known if Mitchell ever exercised these powers in the Seven Provinces but it is known that he resided in Edinburgh, Scotland from 1753 on. He started recruiting for the Order in 1754 and had established a Chapter about 1763. By 1767, this Chapter had raised itself into the present Grand Lodge and Grand Chapter of the Order.

It is interesting to note that one of the documents issued by the Grand Secretary of the original Provincial Grand Lodge of South Britain listed the regular Chapters by seniority. The last entry, written by a different hand, probably Mitchell's, was the Provincial Grand Chapter at Norfolk, Virginia, constituted Oct. 12, 1752. Nothing has ever been found of this body but a set of jewels which seem to have come from it, came into the hands of the present Grand Lodge of the Order in 1775.

The picture is not nearly so simple when one looks at the Scot's or Ecossais degrees. I mentioned that these were developing in England and France sometime after 1730. The information is very confused as many Rites or systems of higher degrees were springing up in the mid to late 1700s, especially in France. The one of most immediate interest is the Rite of Perfection of 25 degrees which seems to have developed between 1750 and 1771. It is from this root that our present Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite has arisen.

In August 1761, a patent was issued in the name of the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of France, to Stephen Morin granting him the authority to promote freemasonry throughout the world. Jackson (Ref. 8.3.4-5 pgs. 39-46) was not certain that the original patent gave Morin the authority to confer the high degrees but the signators had the authority to give this to him, had they wished to do so. Morin was not able to take his patent back to the West Indies immediately because the ship he was traveling on was captured by the English and he spent a year or more in England. As a civilian, he was fairly well left to his own devices and he later claimed that he had met the Grand Master of the Moderns, Lord Ferrers and had been warmly received. He further claimed the Lord Ferrers had added his approval by co-signing the Patent. The original Patent has never been found but several copies, apparently made from it, have turned up.

Morin arrived in the West Indies in 1763 and immediately started developing the Rite of Perfection and translating some of the documents into English. He started calling



himself "Inspector and Deputy of the Grand Lodges of France and England" and before his death claimed to control all the degrees from 4 to 29, which was 4 degrees more than existed in the Rite of Perfection. He was said to have signed himself as 33 degree as early as 1768.

He was apparently very flamboyant and exploited his masonic authority to the full. This earned him many enemies. In contrast, his deputy, Henry Francken, was a much easier man to deal with and made many influential friends. Together they founded a Consistory of Princes of the Royal Secret in Jamaica.

After Morin's death in 1771, Francken completed the production and revision of the rituals. He authorized a Lodge of Perfection at Albany and issued a number of patents as Deputy Inspectors General, both in the West Indies and in America. Francken died in 1795.

The growth of the Rite of Perfection lost its direction after 1780 and became very chaotic especially in America where the various Deputy Inspectors General became very independent. The Grand Council in Paris disappeared during the French Revolution in the late 1700s.

In 1795, Comte de Grasse-Tilly and his father-in-law, Jean Baptiste Delahogue, arrived in Charleston. It is not clear what part they played but, with their assistance the American Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite was founded on 31 May 1801. Twelve yers later this Supreme Council set up the Supreme Council for the Northern Jurisdiction of the United States of America and subsequently changed its title to



the Supreme Council for the Southern Jurisdiction. From these two Supreme Councils have come all the presently existing Supreme Councils throughout the world.

Coil (ref. 8.3.1-7 pgs. 343-345) believes that the Knight Templar degree arose in France sometime after 1741, along with the Rose Croix and Kadosh degrees, as one of the continental high grades. It probably entered England and Scotland in the mid 18th century via Ireland. The Early Baldwin Encampment in Bristol became its initial and leading exponent. Much is unknown about its origin and progress.

The Knights Templar degree probably spread to our continent by Military Lodges in the British forces. The first written reference to a Masonic Templar degree or ceremony is in the minutes of St. Andrew's Royal Arch Lodge or Chapter at Boston, Mass. for Aug. 28, 1769. R.V. Harris (Ref. 8.3.3.4-2) wrote an interesting paper on the beginning of Knight Masonry in Canada. He says that the most likely source of the K.T. ritual worked in Boston was an Irish military lodge called Lodge "Glittering Star" # 322. This Lodge and it's associated Regiment served several times in Canada and in 1966 was in Gibraltar.

The first Grand Conclave of the Grand Elect-Knights Templar Kadosh and Holy Sepulchre of St. John of Jerusalem, Palestine, Rhodes and Malta was held in London in 1791. Thomas Dunckerley was appointed Grand Master of the Knights of the Rosy Cross, Knights Kadosh and Knights Templar in 1793 by the Duke of Kent, the Grand Patron of the Order.

The Order in England fell into abeyance upon Dunckerley's death in 1795 until revived

in 1804 by the Charter of Confirmation issued by the Duke of Kent. The Order waxed and waned over the next 70 years, becoming first a Grand Conclave and then a Convent General in 1873.

In the United States, a Grand Encampment had been formed in Philadelphia in 1795 but this expired fairly soon after formation. The first one which is still in existence was formed in Providence, R.I. in 1805 and was originally called the United States Grand Encampment. In 1816 it dropped the reference to United States and evolved into the Grand Encampment of Massachusetts and Rhode Island. The National Great Priory of the Dominion of Canada was formed in 1876.

The Royal & Select Masters of Cryptic Rite was the 1st of the major Rites to be organized. The Select Master degree evolved from an earlier degree called Select Masons of 27 (Ref. 8.3.1-8 pgs. 536-539) which was contained in the rituals brought to this continent about 1762 by Stephen Morin as a side degree of the Rite of Perfection. The Royal Master degree is unknown before 1804 and Coil quotes Gould as stating that the earliest authoritative account of the working of the degree was in 1807.

The first Grand Council of Royal and Select Masters which has survived to today is that in Connecticut which was formed in 1818 although there was an earlier attempt in New York State in 1810. Robertson (Ref. 8.3.3.2-1 pgs. 138-140) states that the first three Councils of Royal and Select Masters in Canada were formed by a charter from the Grand Council of the State of Maine, dated May 18, 1867. These Councils immediately proceeded to

form themselves into the Grand Council of Royal and Select Masters for New Brunswick.

## 6. Conclusion

I have tried to show, in this paper a flow or connected-ness of Masonic speculation from the early operative workings to the major Rites in existence today. There is no one direct path or goal to this growth as it represents the combined efforts of many Masons over several centuries.

We are told that Freemasonry is a system of morality, veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols. The various Rites and ceremonies provide the allegory and explore the symbols. The appendant Orders do not detract from Freemasonry but allow those with special interests to explore the symbols in their own ways. Most of those who I know are heavily involved in these Rites, are also heavily involved in Craft activities. Masonry is what Masons do. Let us do our best to be the ideal of a Mason, as we understand one to be.

## 7. Glossary

AQC - Ars Quatuor Coronatorum  
Transactions of Quatuor Coronati Lodge  
No. 2076

CMRA - Canadian Masonic Research Association

## 8. References and Works Consulted

### 8.1 Catalogues and Indices

- (1) "A Concise Index To The Transactions of The Quatuor Coronati Lodge No. 2076, Vols. 1 - 80" compiled by A.R. Hewitt and H.G. Massey Quatuor Coronati Lodge No. 2076, London 1971
- (2) "Miscellanea Index - Volumes I - IX (1933 - ,1970)" compiled by William G. Peacher, P.S.M. published by the Grand Council of the Allied Masonic Degrees of the United States of America (undated)
- (3) Index to Canadian Masonic Research Association papers  
Papers (1949 - 1975)  
CMRA April 1975
- (4) "A Catalogue of the Masonic Collection of A.J.B. Milborne Housed in the Public Archives, Ottawa, Canada"  
by Glenison T. Jones  
produced as a 125th Anniversary Project for the Grand Lodge of Canada in the Province of Ontario in 1980.

### 8.2 Operative

- (1) "The Mediaeval Mason"  
by Douglas Knoop and G.P. Jones  
Manchester University Press, 1933
- (2) "Constitutions Rules and Regulations"  
Published under the authority of  
The Worshipful Society of Free



Masons Rough Masons, Wallers,  
Slaters, Paviers, Plaisterers and  
Bricklayers London. 27th September,  
1977.

### 8.3 Speculative

#### 8.3.1 General

- (1) "History Of The Ancient And  
Honorable Fraternity Of Free And  
Accepted Masons and Concordant  
Bodies".

written by a board of Editors

Henry Leonard Stillson, Editor-In-  
Chief

William James Hughan, European  
Editor

The Fraternity Publishing Company,  
Boston, N.Y. 1904

- (2) "Mackey's Revised History of  
Freemasonry" (7 volumes) by Robert  
Ingham Clegg, 33<sup>O</sup> & William James  
Hughan

The Masonic History Company,  
Chicago, New York, London, 1921

- (3) "History Of The York And Scottish  
Rite Of Freemasonry" by Henry  
Ridgely Evans, Litt. D.

The Masonic Service Association Of  
The United States 1924

- (4) "Masonic Organizations and Allied  
Orders and Degrees" by Harold V.B.  
Voorhis, B.F., F.P.S.

Press of Henry Emmerson, New York,  
1952

- (5) "The Centenary Of St. James Lodge No. 74, A.F. & A.M. South Augusta, Ontario, 1857 -1957 by Howard W. Warner, July 10, 1956
- (6) "Freemasons' Guide and Compendium" by Bernard E. Jones, P.A.G.D.C. George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd. London New and Revised 1956, reprinted 1979
- (7) "George Canning Longley And His 300 Degrees" by M.W. Bro. R.V. Harris CMRA #54, 1960.
- (8) "Coil's Masonic Encyclopedia" by Henry Wilson Coil, 33<sup>o</sup> edited by Dr. William Moseley Brown, 33<sup>o</sup> Dr. William L. Cummings, 33<sup>o</sup> & Harold Van Buren Voorhis, 33<sup>o</sup> Macoy Publishing & Masonic Supply Company Inc., New York 1961
- (9) "The Rise Of The Ecossais Degrees" Proceedings of the Chapter of Research of The Grand Chapter of Royal Arch Masons of the State of Ohio, Volume X : 1965 The Otterbein Press, Dayton, Ohio
- (10) "Fringe Masonry in England 1870 -85" by Ellic How AQC Vol. 85 (1972), pages 242 to 295
- (11) "Freemasonry And Its Etiquette" by William Preston Cambell-Everden Weathervane Books, New York, 1978
- (12) "Beyond The Craft" by Keith V. Jackson Lewis Masonic, London 1980

- (13) "Harry Carr's World of Freemasonry"  
Lewis Masonic, London 1984

### 8.3.2 Craft

- (1) "The History Of Freemasonry In  
Canada - Vols. I & II"  
by J.Ross Robertson, PGM  
George A. Morang & Co., Toronto,  
1900
- (2) "Freemasonry In The Province Of  
Quebec - 1759 - 1959"  
by A.J.B. Milborne, P.D.D.G.M. G.L.Q.  
Knowlton, P.Q. 1960
- (3) "Grand Lodge 1717 - 1967"  
Printed for the United Grand Lodge  
of England  
University Press, Oxford, 1967
- (4) "The Collected Prestonian Lectures,  
1925 - 1960"  
The Quatuor Coronati Lodge #2076,  
London 1967"
- (5) "The Collected Prestonian Lectures,  
Vol.2, 1961 - 1974"  
Lewis Masonic, London 1980
- (6) "The Beginnings Of Freemasonry in  
America"  
by Melvin M. Johnson  
Masonic Book Club 1983

### 8.3.3 York Rite

- (1) "The York Rite Of Freemasonry"  
by Frederick G. Speidel 1978

### 8.3.3.1 Royal Arch

- (1) "Freemasons' Book Of The Royal Arch"  
by Bernard E. Jones  
George G. Harrap & Company Ltd.,  
London, Toronto, Wellington, Sydney  
1957
- (2) "The Royal Art, A History of Royal  
Arch Masonry in British Columbia and  
the Yukon"  
by R. Jack Meek, Grand Historian  
Grand Chapter of British Columbia  
and the Yukon, June 1, 1984
- (3) "The Cryptic Rite of Freemasonry in  
Canada"  
by Clifford E. Rich  
CMRA #105, 1972
- (4) "The Cryptic Rite, An Historical  
Treatise"  
by Colonel R.J.L. Wilkinson, O.B.E.  
The Grand Council of Royal and Select  
Masters of England and Wales, 1977

### 8.3.3.2 Cryptic Rite

- (1) "The Cryptic Rite:  
Its Origin and Introduction To This  
Continent"  
by J. Ross Robertson (including  
Joshiah H. Drummond)  
Hunter, Rose & Co., Toronto 1888
- (2) "A History of the Cryptic Rite"  
by E.E. Hinman, R.V. Denslow & C.C.  
Hunt  
authorized by the General Grand  
Council R & S.M. of the U.S.A., 1931



#### 8.3.3.3. Ark Mariner

- (1) "The Royal Ark Mariner Degree - Its Origin and History"  
by R.W.Bro. R.M. Handfield-Jones,  
M.C., Grand Librarian September 1968
- (2) "The Royal Ark Mariner Degree Part I  
-History, England, Scotland,  
Ireland, Canada"  
by William G. Peacher, M.D.  
Collectanea, Vol. 12 Part 1, 1983  
Grand College Of Rites Of The United  
States of America
- (3) "The Royal Ark Mariner Degree Part  
II - United States"  
by William G. Peacher , M.D.  
Collectanea, Vol. 12 Part 2, 1985  
Grand College Of Rites Of The United  
States Of America

#### 8.3.3.4 Knights Templar

- (1) "History Of The Knights Templars Of  
Canada"  
by J. Ross Robertson  
Printed by Hunter, Rose & Co.,  
Toronto, 1890
- (2) "The Story Of Lodge 'Glittering  
Star' No. 322 (Irish) (1759-1966)  
And The Beginning Of Knight Templary  
In Canada"  
by Reginald V. Harris, P.S.G.M.  
(Can.)  
CMRA #86, 1966

### 8.3.3.5 Knight Templar Priests

- (1) "Knight Templar Priest as a 'Rite of Memory'"  
by G.E.W. Bridge  
Past Deputy Grand High Priest, 1960
- (2) "Appendant Degrees"  
by H.B. Raylor, Grand High Priest,  
1977
- (3) "Grand College of England and Wales  
and its Tabernacles Overseas  
History"  
by H.B. Raylor, Grand High Priest  
(undated but post June 1979)

### 8.3.3.6 York Rite College

- (1) The York Rite Sovereign College of  
North America - 1957 - 1982  
by Robert S. Spencer and James F.  
Smith

### 8.3.4 Scottish Rite

- (1) "The Story Of The Scottish Rite Of  
Freemasonry"  
by Harold V.B. Voorhis, 33<sup>o</sup>  
Press of Henry Emmerson, New  
York, 1965
- (2) "History Of The Supreme Council 33<sup>o</sup>  
-1861 - 1891 A.A.S.R. of  
Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction"  
by James D. Carter, 33<sup>o</sup>  
The Supreme Council, 33<sup>o</sup>,  
Washington, D.C. 1967
- (3) "History Of The Supreme Council 33<sup>o</sup>  
- 1891 -1921 A.A.S.R. of

Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction"  
by James D. Carter, 33<sup>O</sup>  
The Supreme Council, 33<sup>O</sup>,  
Washington, D.C. 1971

- (4) "The History Of The Supreme Council  
33<sup>O</sup> Ancient And Accepted Scottish  
Rite Of Freemasonry Of Canada 1874 -  
1974"  
by a special committee of the  
Supreme Council, 1978

- (5) "Rose Croix"  
The History of the Ancient and  
Accepted Rite for England & Wales  
by Brig A.C.F. Jackson, CVO, CBE,  
32<sup>O</sup>  
Lewis Masonic, London 1980

#### 8.3.5 Royal Order Of Scotland

- (1) "The Royal Order Of Scotland"  
by Harold V.B. Voorhis  
Press of Henry Emmerson, New York,  
1960
- (2) "The Royal Order Of Scotland"  
by Robert Strathern Lindsay  
edited by A.J.B. Milborne  
published with the authority of the  
Executive Committee by the Grand  
Secretary, Dr. A.F. Buchan  
94a George Street, Edinburgh,  
EH2 3DF, 1971

#### 8.3.6 Red Cross of Constantine

- (1) "What Is The Red Cross Of  
Constantine? A Brief Summary of the

Purpose of These Degrees and Orders"  
by Edward A. Glad, Grand Recorder  
Grand Imperial Council of the  
Imperial, Ecclesiastical and  
Military Order of the Red Cross Of  
Constantine And Appendant Orders for  
the United States of America,  
Mexico and the Philippines  
Third Edition, July, 1955

- (2) "History Of The Red Cross Of  
Constantine In Canada:  
by Reginald V. Harris, Grand  
Historian  
Grand Imperial Conclave of Canada,  
August 4, 1961
- (3) "The Order Of The Red Cross Of  
Constantine"  
by Harold V.B. Voorhis  
Press of Henry Emmerson, New York  
57, N.Y., 1963
- (4) "The History And Origin Of The  
Masonic And Military Order Of The  
Red Cross Of Constantine and The  
Appendant Orders Of The Holy  
Sepulchre And Of St. John The  
Evangelist - An Analytical Survey"  
Published under the authority of the  
Grand Imperial Conclave, London 1971

#### 8.3.7 "Societas Rosicruciana"

- (1) "A History Of Organized Masonic  
Rosicrucianism: Societas  
Rosicruciana"  
by Harold van Buren Voorhis, IX<sup>O</sup>  
Supreme Magus Emeritus, 1983

#### 8.3.8 Allied Masonic Degrees



- (1) "Masonic Order Of St. Lawrence The Martyr"  
Miscellanea, Vol. 4 (1948), pages 27-38  
Grand Council Of Allied Masonic Degrees of The U.S.A.
- (2) "Masonic Order Of St. Lawrence The Martyr"  
Miscellanea, Vol. 5 (1950), pages 34-38  
Grand Council Of Allied Masonic Degrees of The U.S.A.
- (3) "Red Branch of Eri"  
Miscellanea, Vol. 6 (1956), pages 111-119  
Frances J. Scully,  
Grand Council of Allied Masonic Degrees of The U.S.A.
- (4) "History Of The Allied Masonic Degrees Of The United States Of America"  
by Harold V.B. Voorhis, K.G.C.  
published by The Grand Council Of The Allied Masonic Degrees Of The U.S.A. 1971
- (5) "A Century Of The Allied Masonic Degrees An account of the Order of the Allied Masonic Degrees of England and Wales and Territories Overseas, with some notes on the Degrees under its jurisdiction"  
by H.H.C. Prestige, C.B.E., M.A., P.Dep.GM.  
Privately Printed for the Allied Masonic Degrees, London, 1979

- (6) "The Royal Order Of Eri  
- Some Notes on the Origins of the  
Order"  
by Andrew Stephenson, Chancellor  
London, 1985

### 8.3.9 Other Rites

#### 8.3.9.1 Knight Masons

- (1) "The Evolution of Knight Masonry"  
by J. McC. Allen  
published by the Grand Council of  
Knight Masons of Ireland, 1977

## RESPONSE TO THE PAPER

### "THE BYWAYS OF MASONRY"

by

R.W.Bro. Brian Rountree\*

I would like to express my thanks to W.Bro. Jones for this informative paper. I'm sure many members of the HERITAGE LODGE will appreciate having this information collected into one presentation. The 59 works referred to certainly represent a wide cross-section of Masonic Appendant Orders and offer the curious readers the beginnings of avenues of research which may be taken through their own Grand Lodge Libraries.

W.Bro. Jones has done an admirable job of sorting through the facts, fancy and rhetoric associated with the Orders he discusses, particularly that of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite: the story of Stephen Morin and the growth of the Rite is very involved and it is a marvel that the author has been able to discuss it in just over one page.

The Royal Order of Scotland is mentioned in two places. In the first, at the beginning of section 5, W.Bro Jones tells us that the Order was formed in 1750 and then "seems to have disappeared about the time of the formation of the Grand Lodge of the Ancients (1751). "While it is certainly possible for this to have happened in only one year, I cannot reconcile it with the note by Bro.F.

---

\*This response was read in Lodge by W.Bro. Donald Moore.

Smyth that the Order worked from the granting of the warrant in 1750 until the early 1800s and was then in abeyance until it was revived in 1839 (The Pocket History of Freemasonry, p.240). Perhaps W.Bro. Jones could explain this a bit more.

I would appreciate further information on the term "Grand Lodge and Grand Chapter" of the (Royal) Order. Keith Jackson mentions that the designated title is the "Grand Lodge of the Royal Order of Scotland" (Beyond the Craft, p.57) although F. Smyth indicates that the two degrees conferred are (i) Heredom of Kilwinning (in a Provincial Grand Lodge) and (ii) Knight of the Rosy Cross (in a Provincial Grand Chapter).

I confess that for the longest time I was one of those Masons who assumed that the Revival of 1717 meant that the Grand Lodge was in charge of the whole of England, even though I knew that the rural lodges did not in the beginning respond to the new Grand Lodge. So I was set to argue about the restriction of the authority of this Grand Lodge to London and Westminster. That is, until I recently re-read Anderson's Constitutions, and William Preston who states that the four founding lodges were "the only four lodges in being in the South of England at that time" (Illustrations of Masonry, p.209). Further on he states that "the revival of Masonry in the South of England did not interfere with the proceedings of the fraternity in the North" (p.219) referring to the Grand Lodge of All England, at York.

In his history of "The Province of York, 1710-1970" Bro. A.D.C. Grasby indicates that a lodge composed of speculative masons existed



in the 1620s, earlier than the 1646 date mentioned by W.Bro. Jones and other authors.

On the whole I enjoyed the paper. I noticed that W.Bro. Jones achieved his purpose and did it in a very readable style of writing. I would recommend that the Order and Rites which will be talked about be mentioned or listed in the beginning of the article. And perhaps the sections could have further sub-headings for the ease of the reader in finding a particular Rite.

I agree that there is room for several more papers derived from this one.

1. An explanation of why and when the wording of the eleventh "Ancient Charges and Regulations" was shortened. In section 3 W.Bro. Jones indicates that the full wording appeared in the Consitution of the U.G.L. of England in 1827. But it is only the abbreviated form which appears now in the 1970 copy which I have, and in the recent Constitutions of Manitoba and Ontario.
2. To trace the Rites and Orders which W. Bro. Jones discussed to formation of their respective Grand Bodies in Canada.
3. To discuss some of the other Bodies formed in the 1800s--
  - i. Societas Rosicruciana in Anglia
  - ii. Allied Masonic Degrees
  - iii. Red Cross of Constantine

I wish to express my thanks to R.W. Bro. David Bradley for arranging for me to review a draft copy of this excellent paper.

## OUR DEPARTED BRETHREN

The following names of deceased brethren have come to our attention during the past year. Some dates of death were not known.

W. GORDON BUNKER, P.D.D.G.M.

Oshawa

Lebanon Lodge No. 139

Died April, 1986

DAVID COUPAR, P.M.

Stoney Creek

Doric Lodge No. 121

Died May 7, 1986

GEORGE BRUCE ENGLISH, M.M.

Scarborough

Birch Cliff Lodge No. 612

EDWARD M. JAQUES, P.M.

Port Dover

Erie Lodge No. 149

Died May 8, 1986

JACK SHIP, P.M.

(Charter Member)

Guelph

Wyndham Lodge No. 688

Died January, 1986

G. ALEXANDER FORBES

(Charter Member)

Cambridge

New Hope Lodge No. 279

Died May, 1986

ALFRED MAIZELS, P.M.

Toronto

J.B. Hall Lodge No. 145

Died April 11, 1986.

## GRAND LODGE OFFICERS (1985-1986)

THE MOST WORSHIPFUL THE GRAND MASTER

M.W.Bro. A. Lou Copeland

7449 Victoria Park Avenue, Markham, L3R 2Y7

THE DEPUTY GRAND MASTER

R.W.Bro. William R. Pellow

240 Wharncliffe Rd.N., Suite 300, London, N6H 4P2

THE GRAND SECRETARY

M.W.Bro. Robert Davies

P.O.Box 217, (363 King St.W.) Hamilton, L8N 3C9

## THE HERITAGE LODGE OFFICERS (1985-1986)

Worshipful Master	R.W.Bro. Robert S. Throop
Immediate Past Master	R.W.Bro. C. Edwin Drew
Senior Warden	W.Bro. Albert A. Barker
Junior Warden	R.W.Bro. Edsel C. Steen
Chaplain	R.W.Bro. Arthur W. Watson
Treasurer	R.W.Bro. Duncan J. McFadgen
Secretary	R.W.Bro. W. Gray Rivers
Assistant Secretary	W.Bro. George F. Moore
Senior Deacon	R.W.Bro. Edmund V. Ralph
Junior Deacon	V.W.Bro. Donald Kaufman
Director of Ceremonies	R.W.Bro. David C. Bradley
Inner Guard	R.W.Bro. Wilfred T. Greenhough
Tyler	W.Bro. Donald D. Thornton
Senior Steward	W.Bro. Frank G. Dunn
Junior Steward	W.Bro. Stephen H. Maizels
Organist	R.W.Bro. Leonard R. Hertel
Historian	W.Bro. Gregory C. Robinson

## PAST MASTERS

1977 (U.D.)	R.W.Bro. Jacob Pos
1978	R.W.Bro. Jacob Pos
1979	R.W.Bro. Keith R. Flynn
1980	R.W.Bro. Donald Grinton
1981	M.W.Bro. Ronald E. Groshaw
1982	V.W.Bro. George Zwicker
1983	R.W.Bro. Balfour LeGresley
1984	R.W.Bro. David C. Bradley
1985	R.W.Bro. C. Edwin Drew

## CHAIRMEN. LODGE COMMITTEES (1985-86)

Archivist	W.Bro. Glen T. Jones
Editor	R.W.Bro. Jacob Pos
Masonic Information	R.W.Bro. David C. Bradley
Finance	W.Bro. Donald D. Thornton
Membership	V.W.Bro. Richard D. Quinton
H.O.M.E.	V.W.Bro. Alan D. Hogg
Central Data Bank	W.Bro. F. James M. Major
Publications	R.W.Bro. Balfour LeGresley
Specil Events	R.W.Bro. Kenneth L. Whiting
Auditors	R.W.Bro. James Curtis
	R.W.Bro. Kenneth G. Bartlett

### The Corporation:

President	J. Pos
Secretary	E.V. Ralph
	56 Castlegrove
	Don Mills, M3A 1L2





CHARLES ERNEST BALFOUR LE GRESLEY

Worshipful Master 1982 - 83

Born:

April 7, 1929, Newcastle, Ontario.  
Grew up on a large dairy farm.

Education:

Newcastle High School and Albert College,  
Belleville.  
Ryerson Institute of Technology:  
Photographic Arts 1951-54  
University of Toronto: B.A., 1958;  
M.Ed. (OISE) 1970.

Professional: (Teaching Science and Chemistry)

Etobicoke Collegiate Institute. 5 years.  
White Oaks Secondary School, Oakville,  
4 years, (founded Science Department).  
Faculty of Education, Univ. of Toronto,  
17 years, teaching chemistry.

Masonic:

Initiated in Durham Lodge No. 66,  
Newcastle, 1955.  
Affiliated with University, Lodge No.  
496, Toronto, 1964; W.M. 1974.  
Toronto Valley Scottish Rite,, 32 deg.,

1967.

Secretary, Toronto District 7, Senior  
Wardens Assoc. 1973.

Ch. Member The Heritage Lodge No. 730,  
1977.

Grand Senior Warden, 1980.

Member of the following Masonic Research  
Associations: Quatuor Coronatti (London  
England); Missouri Lodge of Research,  
Phoenix Lodge of Research (Paris);  
Philalethes Society; Masonic Book Club;  
Canadian Masonic Research Association,  
V.P. for Ontario 1973 - 76.

# The Heritage Lodge No. 730

A.F. & A.M., G. R. & C.

Instituted: September 21, 1977

Constituted: September 23, 1978

Preston-Heepeler Masonic Temple

## Application for Affiliation

To the Worshipful Master, Wardens and Brethren of The Heritage Lodge No. 730, of the Grand Lodge of A.F. & A.M. of Canada, in the Province of Ontario.

I, \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_  
(PRINT NAME IN FULL) (COMPLETE MAILING ADDRESS)

Postal Code \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

in the County of \_\_\_\_\_ in the Province of Ontario  
Occupation \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Birth \_\_\_\_\_

being a \_\_\_\_\_ Mason, and desirous of becoming a  
(FULL MASONIC RANK)  
member of The Heritage Lodge No. 730, do declare as follows:

I am not in debt to any Lodge for dues or otherwise.

I was Initiated \_\_\_\_\_ Passed and Raised in \_\_\_\_\_  
(DATE)

Lodge No. \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ under the jurisdiction of  
the Grand Lodge of \_\_\_\_\_ and am in good Masonic

standing. I ☐ am now ☐ was last a member of \_\_\_\_\_ Lodge No. \_\_\_\_\_

Dated at \_\_\_\_\_ this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

Signature in full \_\_\_\_\_

Recommended by: 1 \_\_\_\_\_

Bro. \_\_\_\_\_ The Heritage Lodge No. 730

(Name)

2 \_\_\_\_\_

Bro. \_\_\_\_\_ The Heritage Lodge No. 730

(Name)

3 \_\_\_\_\_

Bro. \_\_\_\_\_ No.

(Name)

Lodge

4 \_\_\_\_\_

Bro. \_\_\_\_\_ No.

(Name)

Lodge

5 \_\_\_\_\_

Bro. \_\_\_\_\_ No.

(Name)

Lodge

